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Abstract

In this paper, we study the tradeoff between the approximation guarantee and adaptivity for the problem of maximizing a monotone submodular function subject to a cardinality constraint. The adaptivity of an algorithm is the number of sequential rounds of queries it makes to the evaluation oracle of the function, where in every round the algorithm is allowed to make polynomially-many parallel queries. Adaptivity is an important consideration in settings where the objective function is estimated using samples and in applications where adaptivity is the main running time bottleneck. Previous algorithms achieving a nearly-optimal $1 - 1/e - \epsilon$ approximation require $\Omega(n)$ rounds of adaptivity. In this work, we give the first algorithm that achieves a $1 - 1/e - \epsilon$ approximation using $O(\ln n/\epsilon^2)$ rounds of adaptivity. The number of function evaluations and additional running time of the algorithm are $O(n \text{poly} (\log n, 1/\epsilon))$.

1 Introduction

The general problem of maximizing a monotone submodular function subject to a size constraint captures many problems of interest both in theory and in practice, including sensor placement, clustering, and influence maximization in social networks. This problem has received considerable attention over the past few decades. The classical work of Nemhauser, Wolsey, and Fischer [NWF78] showed that a very natural Greedy algorithm achieves a $1 - 1/e$ approximation for the problem, and this approximation is known to be optimal [Fei98, Von09, DV12]. The ensuing decades have led to the development of powerful algorithmic frameworks as well as new applications in areas such as machine learning and data mining.

The Greedy algorithm and its variants play a central role in these developments: Greedy algorithms are natural and simple to use and they achieve the best known approximation guarantees in many settings of interest. The main drawback of Greedy algorithms is that they are inherently sequential and their decisions are intrinsically adaptive.

A recent line of work has focused on addressing the first drawback of Greedy algorithms, and it has led to the development of distributed algorithms for submodular maximization problems in parallel models of computation such as MapReduce [KMVV13, MKSK13, MZ15, BENW15, MKBK15, BENW16, EMZ17]. The main focus of these works is on parallelizing sequential algorithms such as Greedy and its variants in order to achieve tradeoffs between the approximation guarantee and resources such as the number of rounds of MapReduce computation and the total
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amount of communication. In particular, Barbosa et al. [BENW16] show that it is possible to achieve a nearly-optimal $1 - 1/e - \epsilon$ approximation using $O(1/\epsilon)$ MapReduce rounds. The algorithms developed in these works run a Greedy algorithm on each of the machines, and thus they are just as adaptive as the sequential algorithms.

Very recently, Balkanski and Singer [BS18] initiated the study of the following question: can we design algorithms for submodular maximization that are less adaptive? The adaptivity of an algorithm is the number of sequential rounds of queries it makes to the evaluation oracle of the function, where in every round the algorithm is allowed to make polynomially-many parallel queries:

**Definition 1 ([BS18]).** Given an oracle $f$, an algorithm is $r$-adaptive if every query $q$ to the oracle $f$ occurs at a round $i \in [r]$ such that $q$ is independent of the answers $f(q')$ to all other queries $q'$ at round $i$.

Adaptivity is an important consideration in settings where the objective function is estimated using samples and in applications where adaptivity is the main running time bottleneck. In applications of submodular maximization such as influence maximization and experimental design, queries are experiments that take time and can benefit greatly from parallel execution. In the broader context of optimization and computation, a lot of effort has been devoted to studying the tradeoff of adaptivity and other resources. For example, in property testing, adaptivity has been shown to be crucial with huge gaps in query complexity between non-adaptive and adaptive algorithms and more generally algorithms with different number of adaptive rounds [RS06, CG17]. In compressed sensing, adaptive algorithms can have exponentially fewer measurements than non-adaptive ones (see e.g. [IPW11]). We refer the reader to [BS18] for a more detailed discussion of applications of submodular maximization and the importance of adaptivity in their contexts as well as the study of adaptivity in various areas.

Balkanski and Singer give an algorithm that achieves a $1/3 - \epsilon$ approximation using $O(\log n/\epsilon^2)$ rounds of adaptivity, and they show that $\Omega(\log n/\log \log n)$ rounds of adaptivity are needed in order to obtain a $1/\log n$ approximation.

Thus there are now two incomparable algorithms for submodular maximization: the classical Greedy with optimal $1 - 1/e$ approximation but $O(k)$ adaptivity and the algorithm of [BS18] with $O(\log n/\epsilon^2)$ adaptivity but $1/3 - \epsilon$ approximation. One cannot help but ask

**Is there an inherent tradeoff between adaptivity and approximation?**

In this work, we obtain an algorithm that is the best of both worlds with nearly optimal approximation $1 - 1/e - \epsilon$ and $O(\log n/\epsilon^2)$ adaptivity and $O(n \text{ poly}(\log n, 1/\epsilon))$ total number of queries and additional running time.

**Theorem 2.** For the problem of maximizing a monotone submodular function subject to a cardinality constraint and any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $O(\log n/\epsilon^2)$-adaptive randomized algorithm which obtains a $1 - 1/e - \epsilon$ approximation with high probability. The number of function evaluations and additional running time of the algorithm are $O(n \text{ poly}(\log n, 1/\epsilon))$. 

2
2 The algorithm

\textbf{Algorithm 1} The input is a submodular function \( f : 2^V \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \) that is monotone and non-negative, a cardinality constraint \( k \), and an error parameter \( \epsilon \).

1: For a set \( U \subseteq V \) and an integer \( \ell \leq |U| \), we let \( \mathcal{U}(U, \ell) \) be the uniform distribution over subsets of \( U \) of cardinality \( \ell \).
2: \( M \) is an approximate optimal solution value: \( M \leq f(\text{OPT}) \leq (1 + \epsilon)M \).
3: \( m = O((\ln n)^2/\epsilon^4) \), \( \ell = \epsilon^2 k/(100 \ln n) \).
4: \( S = \emptyset \).
5: \textbf{while} \( f(S) \leq (1 - 1/\epsilon - O(\epsilon))M \) \textbf{do}
6: \hspace{1em} \( U_1 = V \setminus S \) \hspace{1em} \( \triangleright \) Unfiltered elements
7: \hspace{1em} \( t = 0 \)
8: \hspace{1em} \( \text{Old} = f(S) \)
9: \hspace{1em} \textbf{while} \( f(S) - \text{Old} < \epsilon M/100 \) \textbf{do}
10: \hspace{2em} \( t \leftarrow t + 1 \)
11: \hspace{2em} \textbf{Let} \( R_1, \ldots, R_m \) be independent samples from \( \mathcal{U}(U_t, \ell) \)
12: \hspace{2em} \textbf{Let} \( \max_{R \subseteq \{R_1, \ldots, R_m\}} f(R|S) \)
13: \hspace{2em} \textbf{if} \( f(R_{\max}|S) \geq \frac{1}{k}(1 - 100\epsilon)(M - \text{Old}) \) \textbf{then}
14: \hspace{3em} \( S \leftarrow S \cup \max_{R \subseteq \{R_1, \ldots, R_m\}} f(R|S) \)
15: \hspace{3em} \( U_{t+1} = U_t \setminus \max_{R \subseteq \{R_1, \ldots, R_m\}} f(R|S) \)
16: \hspace{2em} \textbf{else}
17: \hspace{3em} \textbf{Let} \( \{R_{i,j} : 1 \leq i \leq \Theta(\ln n/\epsilon), 1 \leq j \leq m \} \) be independent samples from \( \mathcal{U}(U_t, \ell) \)
18: \hspace{3em} \textbf{Let} \( v_{i,e} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} f(e|S \cup R_{i,j}) \)
19: \hspace{3em} \textbf{Let} \( \text{avg}_i = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} f(R_{i,j}|S) \)
20: \hspace{3em} \textbf{Let} \( i \) be s.t. \( \text{avg}_i \leq (1 - 8\epsilon)\frac{1}{k}(M - \text{Old}) \) and \( \sum_{e \in U_t} v_{i,e} \leq |U_t|(1 - 8\epsilon)\frac{M - \text{Old}}{k} \)
21: \hspace{3em} \textbf{if} there is no such \( i \), declare failure and terminate
22: \hspace{3em} \( U_{t}^{-} = \{e \in U_t : v_{i,e} < (1 - 7\epsilon)\frac{M - \text{Old}}{k} \} \)
23: \hspace{3em} \( U_{t+1} = U_t \setminus U_{t}^{-} \)
24: \hspace{2em} \textbf{end if}
25: \hspace{1em} \textbf{end while}
26: \textbf{end while}
27: \textbf{return} \( S \)

Let \( f : 2^V \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \) be a set function on a ground set \( V \) of size \( n = |V| \). The function is submodular if \( f(A) + f(B) \geq f(A \cap B) + f(A \cup B) \) for all subsets \( A, B \). The function is monotone if \( f(A) \leq f(B) \) for all subsets \( A, B \) satisfying \( A \subseteq B \).

In this section, we consider the problem of maximizing a monotone submodular function subject to a cardinality constraint: find \( S^* \in \arg \max_{S \subseteq V : |S| \leq k} f(S) \).

\textbf{Preliminaries.} For any two sets \( A \) and \( B \), we use the notation \( f(A|B) \) to denote the marginal gain of \( A \) on top of \( B \), i.e., \( f(A|B) = f(A \cup B) - f(B) \). For an element \( e \in V \), we use \( f(e|B) \) as a shorthand for \( f(\{e\}|B) \).

We will use the following property several times, which follows from submodularity and monotonicity.

\textbf{Claim 3.} For any sets \( A, B, C \), we have \( f(A|B \cup C) \leq f(A|C) \).
We will use the following Chernoff inequality, which follows from the standard Chernoff bound (see, e.g., [DP09]).

**Theorem 4 ([DP09]).** Let \(X_1, \ldots, X_n\) be mutually independent and identically distributed random variables with \(X_i \in [0, 1]\). Let \(X = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i\). Suppose that \(\mathbb{E}[X] \leq \mu_H\). Then, for every \(0 < \epsilon < 1\), we have

\[
\Pr[X > (1 + \epsilon)\mu_H] \leq \exp \left( -\frac{\epsilon^2}{3} n \mu_H \right).
\]

**The analysis.** We devote the rest of this section to the analysis of the algorithm shown in Algorithm 1. We assume that the algorithm has access to a value \(M\) such that \(M \leq f(OPT) \leq (1 + \epsilon)M\). An \(n\)-approximation to \(f(OPT)\) is \(M_0 = \max_{e \in V} f\{\{e\}\}\). Given this value, we can try \(2\epsilon^{-1} \ln n\) guesses for \(M\): \(M_0, (1 + \epsilon)M_0, (1 + \epsilon)^2 M_0, \ldots\) in parallel and return the best solution from all the guesses.

We divide the execution of the algorithm into phases corresponding to the iterations of the outer while loop. We will show that the number of phases is bounded by \(O(1/\epsilon)\) and the number of iterations of the inner while loop in each phase is \(O(\ln n/\epsilon)\). Therefore, the total number of rounds of adaptivity is \(O(\ln n/\epsilon^2)\).

Consider an iteration of the inner while loop. We show that if \(\mathbb{E}_{R \sim \mathcal{U}(U, \ell)}[f(R|S)] \geq \frac{\ell}{k}(1 - 9\epsilon)(M - \text{Old})\) then with high probability, the algorithm executes line 14 (see Lemma 5). On the other hand, if \(\mathbb{E}_{R \sim \mathcal{U}(U, \ell)}[f(R|S)] < \frac{\ell}{k}(1 - 9\epsilon)(M - \text{Old})\) then, with high probability, the elements filtered on line 22 account for at least an \(\epsilon\) fraction of all elements in \(U\) (see Lemma 6).

**Lemma 5.** Consider an iteration \(t\) with \(\mathbb{E}_{R \sim \mathcal{U}(U_t, \ell)}[f(R|S)] \geq \frac{\ell}{k}(1 - 9\epsilon)(M - \text{Old})\). With probability \(1 - 1/n^2\), we have \(f(R_{\max}|S) \geq \frac{\ell}{k}(1 - 9\epsilon)(M - \text{Old})\) and the algorithm executes line 14.

**Proof.** Note that, for a sample \(R \sim \mathcal{U}(U_t, \ell)\), we have \(0 \leq f(R|S) \leq f(OPT) \leq (1 + \epsilon)M\): the first inequality follows by monotonicity, and the second inequality follows from the fact that \(f(R|S) \leq f(R) \leq f(OPT)\), since \(R\) is feasible.

Since \((1 + \epsilon)M - f(R|S)\) is a non-negative random variable, it follows from Markov’s inequality that

\[
\Pr_{R \sim \mathcal{U}(U_t, \ell)} \left[ (1 + \epsilon)M - f(R|S) > (1 + \epsilon)M - \frac{\ell}{k}(1 - 10\epsilon)(M - \text{Old}) \right]
\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{R \sim \mathcal{U}(U_t, \ell)}[(1 + \epsilon)M - f(R|S)]}{(1 + \epsilon)M - \frac{\ell}{k}(1 - 10\epsilon)(M - \text{Old})}
\leq \frac{(1 + \epsilon)M - \frac{\ell}{k}(1 - 9\epsilon)(M - \text{Old})}{(1 + \epsilon)M - \frac{\ell}{k}(1 - 10\epsilon)(M - \text{Old})}
= 1 - \frac{\ell}{k} \epsilon(M - \text{Old})
= 1 - \Theta \left( \frac{\epsilon^3}{\ln n} \right).
\]

The second inequality is our assumption, and the last equality follows from the fact that \(\ell/k = \Theta(\epsilon^2/\ln n)\) and \((1/\epsilon + O(\epsilon))M \leq M - \text{Old} \leq M\).
Therefore, with probability at least $\Omega(e^3/\ln n)$, we have $f(R|S) \geq \frac{\ell}{n}(1 - 10\epsilon)(M - Old)$. Since we take $m = \Theta((\ln n)^2/\epsilon^4)$ independent samples, with probability at least $1 - 1/n^2$, we find a sample $R_{max}$ such that $f(R_{max}|S) \geq \frac{\ell}{n}(1 - 10\epsilon)(M - Old)$.

**Lemma 6.** Consider an iteration $t$ in which $E_{R \sim U(U_t, \ell)}[f(R|S)] \leq \frac{\ell}{n}(1 - 9\epsilon)(M - Old)$ and the algorithm executes line 20. With probability at least $1 - 1/n^3$, the algorithm does not fail on line 21. Additionally, if the algorithm does not fail then $|U_t^-| \geq \epsilon |U_t|$.

**Proof.** We start by showing the following claim.

**Claim 7.** We have

$$E_{R \sim U(U_t, \ell)}[f(R|S)] \geq \sum_{e} \frac{\ell}{|U_t|} \cdot E[f(e|S \cup R)].$$

**Proof.** Consider a sample $R$. Order the elements of $R$ arbitrarily as $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_\ell$ and let $R_0 = \emptyset$ and $R_i = \{e_1, \ldots, e_i\}$.

$$f(R|S) = f(S \cup R) - f(S) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (f(S \cup R_i) - f(S \cup R_{i-1})) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} f(e_i|S \cup (R \setminus \{e_i\})) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} f(e_i|S \cup (R \setminus \{e_i\}))$$

where the last inequality follows from submodularity.

Therefore we have

$$E_{R \sim U(U_t, \ell)}[f(R|S)] \geq E \left[ \sum_{e \in R} f(e|S \cup (R \setminus \{e\})) \right] = \sum_{e} \Pr[e \in R] \cdot E[f(e|S \cup (R \setminus \{e\}))|e \in R] = \sum_{e} \frac{\ell}{|U_t|} \cdot E[f(e|S \cup (R \setminus \{e\}))|e \in R]$$

Let us now show that, for every $e$, we have

$$E_{R \sim U(U_t, \ell)}[f(e|S \cup (R \setminus \{e\}))|e \in R] \geq E_{R \sim U(U_t, \ell)}[f(e|S \cup (R \setminus \{e\}))|e \notin R]$$

To this end, note that we may assume that $R \sim U(U_t, \ell)$ is generated by choosing a permutation $\pi$ of $U_t$ uniformly at random and letting $R = \{e_{\pi_1}, e_{\pi_2}, \ldots, e_{\pi_\ell}\}$ be the first $\ell$ elements in this permutation. We have

$$E_{R \sim U(U_t, \ell)}[f(e|S \cup (R \setminus \{e\}))|e \in R] = E_{R' \sim U(U_t \setminus \{e\}, \ell-1)}[f(e|S \cup R')|e \in R] = E_{R \sim U(U_t, \ell)}[f(e|S \cup (R \setminus \{e, e_{\pi_1}\}))|e \notin R]$$

In the first equality, we have used that, if $R \sim U(U_t, \ell)$ and $e \in R$, then $R \setminus \{e\}$ has the distribution $U(U_t \setminus \{e\}, \ell - 1)$. In the second equality, we have used that, if $R \sim U(U_t, \ell)$ and $e \notin R$, then $R \setminus \{e, e_{\pi_1}\}$ has the distribution $U(U_t \setminus \{e\}, \ell - 1)$, since $e_{\pi_1}$ is an element of $R$. The inequality follows by submodularity.
Therefore
\[
\mathbb{E}_{R \sim \mathcal{U}(U, \ell)}[f(e|S \cup (R \setminus \{e\}))]
\]
\[
= \mathbb{E}[f(e|S \cup (R \setminus \{e\})) | e \in R] \Pr[e \in R] + \mathbb{E}[f(e|S \cup (R \setminus \{e\})) | e \notin R] \Pr[e \notin R]
\]
\[
\leq \mathbb{E}[f(e|S \cup (R \setminus \{e\})) | e \in R] (\Pr[e \in R] + \Pr[e \notin R])
\]
\[
= \mathbb{E}[f(e|S \cup (R \setminus \{e\})) | e \in R]
\]
(2)

By combining (1) and (2), and using submodularity, we obtain
\[
\mathbb{E}_{R \sim \mathcal{U}(U, \ell)}[f(R|S)] \geq \sum_{e} \frac{\ell}{|U|} \mathbb{E}[f(e|S \cup (R \setminus \{e\}))] \geq \sum_{e} \frac{\ell}{|U|} \mathbb{E}[f(e|S \cup R)]
\]

Let us now show that, with probability \(1 - 1/n^3\), there is a batch of samples \(\{R_{i,j} : j \in [m]\}\) with the properties stated on line 20.

Fix a batch \(i\). Using Theorem 4, we can upper bound the probability of the event that \(\text{avg}_i > (1 - 8\epsilon)\frac{M}{k}(M - \text{Old})\) as follows. For each \(j \in [m]\), let \(X_j = \frac{1}{(1+\epsilon)M} f(R_{i,j}|S) \in [0,1]\). Let \(X = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{j=1}^{m} X_j\). By our assumption, we have
\[
\mathbb{E}_{R \sim \mathcal{U}(U, \ell)}[X_j] \leq \frac{1}{(1+\epsilon)M} (1 - 9\epsilon)\frac{\ell}{k}(M - \text{Old}).
\]

Let \(\mu_H = \frac{1}{(1+\epsilon)M} (1 - 9\epsilon)\frac{\ell}{k}(M - \text{Old})\). By Theorem 4
\[
\Pr[X > (1 + \epsilon)\mu_H] \leq \exp \left( \frac{-\epsilon^2}{3} m \mu_H \right) \leq \frac{1}{n^3},
\]
where the second inequality follows by substituting \(m\) and \(\mu_H\), and using the fact that \((M - \text{Old})/M = \Theta(1)\).

We now upper bound the probability of the event that \(\sum_{e \in U_{i}} v_{i,e} > |U_i|(1 - 8\epsilon)\frac{M - \text{Old}}{k}\). By Markov’s inequality, with probability at least \(\epsilon\), we have
\[
\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left( \sum_{e} f(e|S \cup R_{i,j}) \right) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon} \mathbb{E}_{R \sim \mathcal{U}(U, \ell)} \left[ \sum_{e} f(e|S \cup R) \right]
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon} \frac{|U_i|}{\ell} \mathbb{E}_{R \sim \mathcal{U}(U, \ell)}[f(R|S)]
\]
\[
\leq \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon} \frac{|U_i|}{\ell} \frac{\ell}{k}(1 - 9\epsilon)(M - \text{Old})
\]
\[
\leq |U_i|(1 - 8\epsilon)\frac{M - \text{Old}}{k}
\]

In the second inequality, we have used Claim 7.

Therefore each batch \(i\) satisfies both conditions of line 20 with probability at least \(\epsilon - 1/n^3\).

Since the batches are independent, it follows that the probability that the algorithm fails on line 21 is at most \((1 - \epsilon + 1/n^3)^{\Theta(ln n/\epsilon)} \leq 1/n^3\).
Let us now condition on the event that the algorithm does not fail. Consider the set $U_t^-$ filtered on line 22. We have
\[|U_t \setminus U_t^-|(1 - 7\epsilon)\frac{M - Old}{k} \leq \sum_{e \in U_t} v_{i,e} \leq |U_t|(1 - 8\epsilon)\frac{M - Old}{k},\]
and thus $|U_t^-| \geq \epsilon|U_t|$.

\[\square\]

**Lemma 8.** Consider a phase of the algorithm. The phase increases $f(S)$ by $\Omega(\epsilon M)$. Additionally, with probability at least $1 - 1/n^2$, the phase has $O(\ln n/\epsilon)$ iterations.

**Proof.** The lower bound on the increase follows from the terminating condition for the phase. Thus it only remains to bound the number of iterations. We refer to each iteration as a gain iteration if line 13 is executed, and as a filtering iteration if line 16 is executed. We show that the number of gain iterations is $O(\ln n/\epsilon)$ with probability 1, and the number of filter iterations is $O(\ln n/\epsilon)$ with probability at least $1 - 1/n^2$.

**Claim 9.** The number of gain iterations is at most $6 \ln n/\epsilon$.

**Proof.** Each gain iteration increases $f(S)$ by $\ell_k(1 - 10\epsilon)(M - Old)$. Since $M - Old \geq M/3$ and the phase ends when $f(S) - Old$ becomes $\epsilon M/100$, the number of gain iterations is at most $6 \ln n/\epsilon$. \[\square\]

Let us now consider the filtering iterations. Let $T$ be the minimum of $2 \ln n/\epsilon + 1$ and the number of filtering iterations of the phase. By Lemma 6, the probability that none of the first $T$ filtering iterations fails is at least $1 - T/n^3 \geq 1 - 1/n^2$. In the following, we condition on the event that none of the first $T$ filtering iterations fails.

We can show the following invariant.

**Claim 10.** Consider an iteration $t$ and suppose that the number of filtering iterations so far is at most $T$. At the beginning of iteration $t$, we have
\[f((\text{OPT} \cap U_t) \cup S) \geq M - \frac{(t - 1)\ell}{k}(M - Old) - \frac{|\text{OPT} \setminus (U_t \cup S)|}{k}(1 - 7\epsilon)(M - Old).\]

**Proof.** We will prove the invariant by induction on $t$. The invariant is true at the beginning of iteration 1 since $f((\text{OPT} \cap U_1) \cup S) \geq f(\text{OPT}) \geq M$.

Consider iteration $t > 1$ and suppose the invariant holds at the beginning of iteration $t$. We will show that the invariant continues to hold at the beginning of iteration $t + 1$.

Suppose that iteration $t$ is a gain iteration. The algorithms adds the sample $R_{\text{max}}$ to $S$ on line 14 and we have
\[f((\text{OPT} \cap (U_t \setminus R_{\text{max}})) \cup S \cup R_{\text{max}}) \geq f((\text{OPT} \cap U_t) \cup S),\]
since $(\text{OPT} \cap (U_t \setminus R_{\text{max}})) \cup S \cup R_{\text{max}} \supseteq (\text{OPT} \cap U_t) \cup S$ and $f$ is monotone. Thus the invariant continues to hold at the beginning of iteration $t + 1$.

Therefore we may assume that iteration $t$ is a filtering iteration. Recall that we are conditioning on the event that the algorithm does not fail in the first $T$ filtering iterations, and thus iteration $t$
executes line 22. Let $i$ be the index satisfying the conditions on line 20. We have

$$f(\text{OPT} \cap U_{t+1}|S)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} f(\text{OPT} \cap U_{t+1}|S \cup R_{i,j})$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left( f(\text{OPT} \cap U_{t}|S \cup R_{i,j}) - \sum_{e \in \text{OPT} \cap U_{t}^{-}} f(e|S \cup R_{i,j}) \right)$$

$$\geq f(\text{OPT} \cap U_{t}|S) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} f(R_{i,j}|S) - |\text{OPT} \cap U_{t}^{-}|(1 - 7\epsilon) \frac{1}{k}(M - \text{Old})$$

$$\geq f(\text{OPT} \cap U_{t}|S) - \frac{\ell}{k}(M - \text{Old}) - |\text{OPT} \cap U_{t}^{-}|(1 - 7\epsilon) \frac{1}{k}(M - \text{Old})$$

The first and second inequalities follow by submodularity. In the third inequality, we have used monotonicity to bound $f((\text{OPT} \cap U_{t}) \cup S \cup R_{i,j}) \geq f((\text{OPT} \cap U_{t}) \cup S)$, and we have used that $v_{i,e} \leq (1 - 7\epsilon) \frac{1}{k}(M - \text{Old})$ for all $e \in U_{t}^{-}$. In the fourth inequality, we have used that $\text{avg}_{i} \leq \frac{\ell}{k}(1 - 8\epsilon)(M - \text{Old})$.

It follows that the invariant continues to hold at the beginning of iteration $t + 1$. 

**Claim 11.** The number of filtering iterations is at most $2 \ln n/\epsilon$.

**Proof.** Recall that we are conditioning on the event that the first $T$ filtering iterations do not fail. Suppose for contradiction that the number of filtering iterations reaches $2 \ln n/\epsilon + 1$, and let $t$ be the iteration when this happens. By Lemma 6, each filtering iteration removes an $\epsilon$ fraction of $U$ and thus $U_{t} = \emptyset$. By Claim 9, the number of gain iterations is at most $6 \ln n/\epsilon$ and thus $t \leq 8 \ln n/\epsilon + 1$. By Claim 10, at the beginning of iteration $t$, we have

$$f((\text{OPT} \cap U_{t}) \cup S) - f(S)$$

$$\geq M - \frac{(t - 1)\ell}{k}(M - \text{Old}) - \frac{|\text{OPT} \setminus (U_{t} \cup S)|}{k}(1 - 7\epsilon)(M - \text{Old}) - f(S)$$

$$\geq M - \frac{8\epsilon}{100}(M - \text{Old}) - (1 - 7\epsilon)(M - \text{Old}) - f(S)$$

$$= \left(7\epsilon - \frac{8\epsilon}{100}\right)(M - \text{Old}) - (f(S) - \text{Old})$$

$$\geq \left(7\epsilon - \frac{8\epsilon}{100}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{3} M - \frac{\epsilon}{100} M$$

$$> 0$$

In the second inequality, we used that $|\text{OPT} \setminus (S_{t} \cup S)| \leq k$. In the third inequality, we used that $M - \text{Old} \geq (1/\epsilon + O(\epsilon))M \geq 1/3M$. In the last inequality, we used the fact that $f(S) - \text{Old} < \epsilon M/100$, since the phase has not ended.

It follows that $U_{t}$ is non-empty, which is a contradiction. Therefore the number of filtering phases is at most $2 \ln n/\epsilon$. 


Lemma 12. With probability $1 - 1/n$, the algorithm uses $O(\ln n/\epsilon^2)$ rounds of queries.

Proof. The lemma follows from Lemma 8. Each phase increases $f(S)$ by $\Omega(\epsilon M)$ and the algorithm stops when $f(S) \geq (1 - 1/e - O(\epsilon))M$. Thus, the number of phases is $O(1/\epsilon)$. With probability $1 - \frac{1}{en}$, every phase uses $O(\ln n/\epsilon)$ rounds of queries. Therefore, with probability $1 - 1/n$, the total number of rounds of queries is $O(\ln n/\epsilon^2)$.

Finally, we argue that the algorithm achieves $1 - 1/e - O(\epsilon)$ approximation ratio.

Lemma 13. The algorithm achieves a $1 - 1/e - O(\epsilon)$ approximation.

Proof. Consider iteration $j$ of a phase where the algorithm executes line 14. We have

$$f(S \cup R_{\text{max}}) - f(S) \geq |R_{\text{max}}|(1 - 10\epsilon)(M - \text{Old})/k$$

$$\geq |R_{\text{max}}|(1 - 11\epsilon)(M - f(S))/k$$

Using the inequality above, we can show by induction that

$$M - f(S) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{(1 - 11\epsilon)|S|}{k}\right) M.$$  

Initially, $S = \emptyset$ and the inequality holds. Consider an iteration where the inequality holds at the beginning of the iteration. We have

$$M - f(S \cup R_{\text{max}}) \leq (M - f(S)) \left(1 - \frac{|R_{\text{max}}|(1 - 11\epsilon)}{k}\right)$$

$$\leq M \exp\left(-\frac{(1 - 11\epsilon)|S|}{k}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{(1 - 11\epsilon)|R_{\text{max}}|}{k}\right)$$

$$= M \exp\left(-\frac{(1 - 11\epsilon)|S \cup R_{\text{max}}|}{k}\right)$$

This completes the induction.

By the induction, in the first iteration where $f(S) \geq (1 - \exp(-(1 - 12\epsilon)))M$ we must have $|S| \leq (1 - \epsilon)k + \ell < k$. Thus, the final solution satisfies the constraint $|S| \leq k$ and has value $f(S) \geq (1 - \exp(-(1 - 12\epsilon)))M$.
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