

Algorithms for Intersection Graphs of Multiple Intervals and Pseudo-Disks

Chandra Chekuri *
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
chekuri@illinois.edu

Tanmay Inamdar †
The University of Iowa
tanmay-inamdar@uiowa.edu

Abstract

Intersection graphs of planar geometric objects such as intervals, disks, rectangles and pseudo-disks are well studied. Motivated by various applications, Butman et al. [8] in SODA 2007 considered algorithmic questions in intersection graphs of t -intervals. A t -interval is a union of at most t distinct intervals (here t is a parameter) — these graphs are referred to as Multiple-Interval Graphs. Subsequent work by Kammer et al. [21] also considered t -disks and other geometric shapes. In this paper we revisit some of these algorithmic questions via more recent developments in computational geometry. For the minimum weight dominating set problem, we give a simple $O(t \log t)$ approximation for Multiple-Interval Graphs, improving on the previously known bound of t^2 . We also show that it is NP-hard to obtain an $o(t)$ -approximation in this case. In fact, our results hold for the intersection graph of a set of t -pseudo-disks which is a much larger class. We obtain an $\Omega(1/t)$ -approximation for the maximum weight independent set in the intersection graph of t -pseudo-disks. Our results are based on simple reductions to existing algorithms by appropriately bounding the union complexity of the objects under consideration.

1 Introduction

A number of interesting optimization problems can be modeled as packing and covering problems involving geometric objects in the plane such as intervals, disks, rectangles, triangles, convex objects and pseudo-disks. The intersection graphs of geometric objects are also of much interest for both theoretical and practical reasons. For instance the famous Koebe-Andreev-Thurston theorem shows that every planar graph can be represented as the intersection graph of interior-disjoint disks in the plane [27]. Interval graphs are another well-studied class of geometric intersection graph. Such a graph is induced by a finite collection of intervals on the real line — each vertex of the graph represents a (closed) interval on the real line, and there is an edge between two vertices iff the corresponding intervals have a non-empty intersection. Several algorithmic problems on interval graphs are motivated by practical applications such as scheduling and resource allocation.

Several papers in the past [6, 7, 8, 21] studied generalization of geometric intersection graphs to the setting where each (meta) object is now the union of a collection of base geometric objects. To make the discussion concrete we first discuss t -interval graphs. For an integer parameter t , a t -interval is the union of at most t intervals. A t -interval graph is the intersection graph of a collection of t -intervals. These graphs are also called multiple-interval graphs. They have been

*Chandra Chekuri is supported in part by NSF grants CCF-1526799 and CCF-1910149.

†Tanmay Inamdar is supported in part by NSF grant CCF-1615845.

very well-studied from both a graph theoretic and algorithmic point of view. For instance, every graph with maximum degree Δ can be represented as a t -interval graph for $t = \lceil (\Delta + 1)/2 \rceil$ [17]. This demonstrates the modeling power obtained by considering unions of simple geometric objects. Butman et al. [8], building on [6, 7] (which primarily studied the maximum independent set problem), considered several optimization problems over multiple-interval graphs such as minimum vertex cover, minimum dominating set and maximum clique. Unlike the case of interval graphs where these problems are tractable, the corresponding problems in multiple-interval graphs are NP-hard even for small values of t . Butmal et al. describe approximation algorithms for these problems and the approximation ratios depend on t . We refer the reader to [8] and references therein for a detailed discussion of the literature and applications of multiple-interval graphs. In a subsequent work Kammer et al. [21, 20] studied (among other results) intersection graphs of t -disks (a t -disk is a union of at most t disks) and t -fat objects and obtained approximation algorithms for canonical optimization problems on these graphs such as independent set, vertex cover and dominating set (see also [29]).

Motivation and our contribution: The contribution of this paper is to demonstrate that powerful techniques from computational geometry that have been successfully used to develop algorithms for packing and covering problems [9, 10, 28] can be easily extended to provide algorithmic results for t -interval graphs and t -disks and other geometric objects in a unified fashion. For some problems we obtain substantially improved approximation bounds that are near-optimal. Our results extend to t -pseudo-disks while techniques in earlier work that exploited properties of intervals [8] or fatness properties of the underlying objects [21] do not apply to pseudo-disks¹.

Before stating our results in full generality we consider the following geometric covering problem. Given a collection of points on the line and a collection of weighted intervals, find the minimum weight subset of the given intervals that cover all the points. This is a special case of the Set Cover problem and can be solved efficiently via dynamic programming or via mathematical programming — the natural LP in the interval case is known to be an integer polytope since the incidence matrix between intervals and points is totally unimodular (TUM) (it has the consecutive ones property). Now consider the same problem where we need to cover a collection of points by (weighted) t -intervals. Approximation algorithms for this problem were considered by Hochbaum and Levin [18] (in the more general setting of multicover) — they derived a relatively straightforward t -approximation for this problem by reducing it, via the natural LP relaxation, to the case of $t = 1$. As far as we are aware this was the best known approximation to this problem. A natural question is whether the bound of t can be improved. In this paper we show that an $O(\log t)$ -approximation can be obtained via tools from computational geometry such as shallow-cell complexity and quasi-uniform sampling. It is an easy observation that an arbitrary Set Cover instance where each set has at most t elements can be reduced to covering points by t -intervals; thus, for large values of t one obtains an $\Omega(\log t)$ hardness under $\mathsf{P} \neq \mathsf{NP}$. The geometric machinery allows us to derive an $O(\log t)$ -approximation in the much more general setting of covering points by t -pseudo-disks.

We state our results for t -pseudo-disks which capture several shapes of interest including intervals and disks. The geometric approach applies in more generality but here we confine our attention to pseudo-disks.

- An $O(\log t)$ approximation for minimum weight cover of points by t -pseudo-disks.

¹A formal definition is given later in the paper. Informally a collection of connected regions in the plane is called a collection of pseudo-disks if the boundaries of any two of the regions intersect in at most two points. Note that the property is defined by the entire collection.

- An $O(t \log t)$ approximation for the minimum weight dominating set² in t -pseudo-disk graphs. Even for t -intervals the best known previous approximation was t^2 [8]. We observe that, via a simple reduction for Hypergraph Vertex Cover, it is NP-hard to approximate dominating set to within a factor better than $t - 1 - \epsilon$ even in t -interval graphs. Under the Unique Games Conjecture, this lower bound can be slightly improved to $t - \epsilon$.
- An $\Omega(1/t)$ approximation for the maximum weight independent set in t -pseudo-disk graphs. A $1/(2t)$ -approximation was known for t -intervals [7]. For more general shapes such as disks and fat objects, the approximation bounds in [20] depend on t and fatness parameters. Our approach generalizes to packing t -pseudo-disks into capacitated points.

We note that although our results are obtained via simple reductions to existing algorithms in geometric packing and covering, these algorithms use fairly sophisticated ideas such as union complexity and Quasi-Uniform Sampling. Consequently, in some cases, the constants in the approximation guarantees may be worse compared to the known results. However, our results are applicable for wider class of geometric objects. Furthermore, it may be possible to improve the constants for the special case of intervals.

We describe the necessary geometric background in the next subsection. The three problems of interest in this paper are minimum weighted set cover (MWSC), minimum weight dominating set (MWDS) and maximum weight independent set (MWIS). We use MSC, MDS and MIS to refer to the unweighted versions.

1.1 Background from Geometric Approximation via LP Relaxations

The approximability of MWSC, MWDS and MWIS in general graphs is well-understood with essentially tight upper and lower bounds known. In particular it is NP-hard to obtain constant approximations for MWDS and MWIS problems. However, in various geometric setting it is possible to obtain improved algorithms including approximation schemes (PTASes and QPTASes [10, 16, 9, 2, 25, 1]) and constant factor approximations [10, 9, 16]. In this paper we are interested in LP-based approximations for MWSC and MWIS that have been established via techniques that rely on *union complexity* of the underlying geometric objects. Union complexity measures the worst-case representation size of the union of a given collection of objects of a particular type or shape. In the setting of planar objects the typical measure is the number of vertices in the arrangement that appear on the boundary of the union. It is well-known that many geometric objects such as intervals (on a line), disks and squares (in the plane) have linear union complexity. In fact, this holds for an even larger class of geometric objects, namely pseudo-disks [24].

Bounds on union complexity have been used to obtain constant factor and sub-logarithmic approximations for geometric MWSC and its variants (see [13, 11, 28, 9] and [23] for a survey). Chan and Har-Peled [10] showed how union complexity can also be used to obtain improved approximations for the MWIS problem. They give an LP rounding algorithm with approximation guarantee $\Omega(n/u(n))$ for computing an MWIS of n objects with union complexity $u(\cdot)$. We use this result to give $\Omega(1/t)$ -approximation for computing MWIS of t -pseudo-disks. We note that although this implies $\Omega(1/t)$ -approximation for MWIS of t -intervals, t -disks and t -squares; these results were already known [6, 21]. However, they use certain “fatness” properties of the underlying geometric objects, which do not extend to pseudo-disks.

²A dominating set in a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a subset $S \subseteq V$ such that each node $u \in V$ is in S or has a neighbor in S .

Shallow-cell complexity (SCC) is a generalization of the notion of union complexity to abstract set systems [9]. Low SCC has been used to obtain improved approximations for MWSC and MWDS in geometric settings as well some combinatorial settings. Here, the general approach is to round a feasible LP solution using a framework called *Quasi-Uniform Sampling* introduced by Varadarajan [28] originally for geometric settings, and further refined and improved by Chan et al. [9]. We use this framework and the result in [9] to obtain an $O(t \log t)$ -approximation for MWDS of t -pseudo-disks by appropriately bounding the SCC of a related instance via known results on MWDS of disks and pseudo-disks [16, 4]. This coupled with other ideas yields our results on MWSC and MWDS for t -pseudo-disks.

Organization. Section 2 introduces some relevant notation and definitions. Section 3 describes algorithms for covering problems MWDS and MWSC with a focus on the more involved MWDS problem. Section 4 describes algorithms for MWIS and a generalization.

2 Preliminaries

A t -object is defined as the union of at most t geometric objects, where t is a positive integer. Without loss of generality, we assume that each t -object is a union of exactly t objects. We are typically interested in the case when the base objects come from a specific class of geometric shapes, such as intervals, disks, and pseudo-disks.

Definition 1 (Pseudo-disks and t -pseudo-disks). A family \mathcal{S} of connected regions bounded by simple closed curves in general position in the plane is called a collection of *pseudo-disks*, if the boundaries of any distinct $S_i, S_j \in \mathcal{S}$ intersect at most twice. Let \mathcal{S} be a collection of pseudo-disks, and let \mathcal{S}' be a collection of objects obtained by taking union of at most t objects from \mathcal{S} . Then, we say that \mathcal{S}' is a collection of t -pseudo-disks.

Consider a t -object O_i . We use $o_i^{(1)}, o_i^{(2)}, \dots, o_i^{(t)}$ to denote the objects whose union equals O_i . Then, by slightly abusing the notation, we also denote by O_i the set $\{o_i^{(1)}, o_i^{(2)}, \dots, o_i^{(t)}\}$. Note that, in some cases it may be desirable to require that the objects $o_i^{(1)}, o_i^{(2)}, \dots, o_i^{(t)}$ are pairwise disjoint. However we do not impose such a restriction on the objects and allow a more general model where they may intersect.

Next, we formally define the notion of union complexity, which is used to obtain the improved approximation for MWIS in Section 4.

Definition 2 (Union complexity). Let \mathcal{S} be a set of geometric objects in \mathbb{R}^2 . If for any subset of objects $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, the number of arcs on the boundary of the union of objects in \mathcal{R} has at most $u(|\mathcal{R}|)$ vertices, then \mathcal{S} is said to have union complexity $u(\cdot)$. We assume that $u(n) \geq n$ for any $n \geq 1$ and that u is non-decreasing.

3 Minimum Weight Dominating Set and Set Cover

As in Butman et al. [8], we consider the following slight generalization of the Minimum Dominating Set problem. Here, we are given a undirected bipartite intersection graph of t -objects. More formally, $G = (\mathcal{R} \sqcup \mathcal{B}, E)$, where $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \dots, R_N\}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \dots, B_M\}$ are sets of red and blue t -objects respectively. There is an edge between $R_i \in \mathcal{R}$ and $B_j \in \mathcal{B}$ if $R_i \cap B_j \neq \emptyset$. Since each vertex corresponds to a (red or blue) t -object, we will use the term ‘vertex’ and ‘ t -object’ interchangeably. Each $R_i \in \mathcal{R}$ has a non-negative weight w_i . The goal is to find a subset $\mathcal{R}' \subseteq \mathcal{R}$

of minimum weight, such that every blue vertex B_j has a neighbor in the set \mathcal{R}' . Note that the standard MWDS problem is equivalent to the setting where $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{B}$. In the following, we consider the more general setting where \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{B} may be different.

3.1 LP Relaxation and Rounding

Let $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B})$ denote the given instance of the (generalized) MWDS. In an integer programming formulation we have a $\{0, 1\}$ variable x_i corresponding to a red t -object R_i which is intended to be assigned 1 if R_i is selected in the solution, and is assigned 0 otherwise. We relax the integrality constraints and describe the natural LP relaxation below.

$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \sum_{R_i \in \mathcal{R}} w_i x_i \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{R_i: B_j \cap R_i \neq \emptyset} x_i \geq 1, \quad \forall B_j \in \mathcal{B} \\ & && x_i \in [0, 1], \quad \forall R_i \in \mathcal{R} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$
$\tag{2}$

Let x be an optimal LP solution for the given instance $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B})$. Since x is feasible, for every blue t -object B_j , we have $\sum_{R_i: B_j \cap R_i \neq \emptyset} x_i \geq 1$. For each $B_j \in \mathcal{B}$, let $b_j^{(k)} \in B_j$ denote an object

maximizing the quantity $\sum_{R_i: b_j^{(k)} \cap R_i \neq \emptyset} x_i$, where the ties are broken arbitrarily. For simplicity, we

denote $b_j^{(k)}$ by b'_j . Let $\mathcal{B}' := \{b'_j : B_j \in \mathcal{B}\}$. Note that for any $b'_j \in \mathcal{B}'$, $\sum_{R_i: b'_j \cap R_i \neq \emptyset} x_i \geq 1/t$.

For any $R_i \in \mathcal{R}$, let $x'_i = \min\{tx_i, 1\}$, and let x' denote the resulting solution. Then, for any $b'_j \in \mathcal{B}'$, $\sum_{R_i: b'_j \cap R_i \neq \emptyset} x'_i \geq 1$. We emphasize that \mathcal{B}' is a collection of (1-)objects, whereas \mathcal{R} is a collection of t -objects. The following observation follows from the definition of x' .

Observation 1. The solution x' is feasible for the instance $\mathcal{I}' = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B}')$, and we have that $\sum_{R_i \in \mathcal{R}} w_i x'_i \leq t \cdot \sum_{R_i \in \mathcal{R}} w_i x_i$.

The preceding step to reduce to \mathcal{I}' is essentially the same as in [8].

Shallow-Cell Complexity Now, we describe how to round x' to an integral solution via Quasi-Uniform Sampling technique. To discuss this, we first consider the closely related Minimum Weight Set Cover problem (MWSC).

Let X be a set of M elements, and \mathcal{S} be a collection of N subsets of X . Each set $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$ has a non-negative weight w_i . In MWSC the goal is to find a minimum-weight collection of sets \mathcal{S}' such that $\bigcup_{S_i \in \mathcal{S}'} S_i = X$.

The standard LP relaxation for MWSC is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \min & \sum_{S_i \in \mathcal{S}} w_i x_i \\ & \sum_{S_i \ni j} x_i \geq 1 \quad \forall j \in X \\ & x_i \geq 0 \quad \forall S_i \in \mathcal{S} \end{aligned}$$

Let $A \in \{0, 1\}^{M \times N}$ denote the constraint matrix in the LP relaxation above. Each row of A corresponds to an element, and each column corresponds to a set. The entry $A_{ij} = 1$ if the element j is contained in S_i , otherwise $A_{ij} = 0$.

The following crucial definition is from [9].

Definition 3 (Shallow-Cell Complexity). Let $1 \leq k \leq n \leq N$. Let S be any set of n columns and let A_S be the matrix restricted to the columns of S . If the number of distinct rows in A_S with at most k ones is bounded by $f(n, k)$ for any choice of n, k and S , then the instance is said to have the shallow-cell complexity $f(n, k)$.

Using bounds on the Shallow-Cell Complexity of an MWSC instance, it is possible to round a feasible LP solution using a technique known as Quasi-Uniform Sampling [9, 28].

Theorem 1 ([9, 28]). Consider an MWSC instance with Shallow-Cell Complexity $f(n, k) = n\phi(n) \cdot k^c$, where $\phi(n) = O(n)$, and $c \geq 0$ is a constant. Then, there exists an algorithm to round any feasible LP solution for this instance within a factor of $O(\max\{\log \phi(N), 1\})$, where the constant hidden in Big-Oh notation depends on the exponent c .

Usually, $\phi(n)$ is a function of n such that $\phi(n) = O(n)$. However, the same guarantee holds even when ϕ is independent of n . When we apply this theorem, we will set $\phi(n) = O(t^4)$, which is independent of n .

Now, we consider an instance $\mathcal{I}' = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B}')$ of the MWDS problem obtained in the previous section. Recall that \mathcal{R} is a collection of t -objects and \mathcal{B} is a collection of 1-objects. Now, let $\mathcal{R}' = \{r_i^{(k)} \in R_i : R_i \in \mathcal{R}\}$ denote the collection of constituent red 1-objects from \mathcal{R} . Let $\mathcal{I}'' = (\mathcal{R}', \mathcal{B}')$ denote the MWDS instance thus obtained. Notice that an MWDS instance can also be thought of as a MWSC instance. We first prove the following simple lemma.

Lemma 1. Let $\mathcal{I}', \mathcal{I}''$ be MWDS instances as defined above. If the shallow-cell complexity of \mathcal{I}'' is $f(n, k)$, then the shallow-cell complexity of the corresponding instance \mathcal{I}' is $g(n, k) \leq f(nt, kt)$ for any $1 \leq k \leq n \leq N$.

Proof. We prove this fact from the definition of the shallow-cell complexity. Let $A^{\mathcal{I}'}$ denote the constraint matrix corresponding to the instance \mathcal{I}' . Fix some positive integers n, k such that $1 \leq k \leq n \leq |\mathcal{R}|$, and fix a set $S \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ of rows (i.e., t -objects), where $|S| = n$. Let $A_S^{\mathcal{I}'}$ denote the constraint matrix restricted to the columns corresponding to S . Let P denote the set of distinct rows (i.e., blue objects) in $A_S^{\mathcal{I}'}$ with at most k ones. We seek to bound $|P|$.

Let $S' = \{r_i^{(k)} \in R_i : R_i \in S\}$ be the corresponding constituent 1-objects. Note that $S' \subseteq \mathcal{R}'$, and $|S'| \leq nt$. Let $A^{\mathcal{I}''}$ denote the constraint matrix corresponding to the instance \mathcal{I}'' and let $A_{S'}^{\mathcal{I}''}$ denote $A^{\mathcal{I}''}$ restricted to the columns of S' . Let P' denote the set of rows in $A_{S'}^{\mathcal{I}''}$ with at most kt ones. Note that, if a row has at most k ones in $A_S^{\mathcal{I}'}$, then it corresponds to exactly one row in P' . Therefore, $|P| \leq |P'| \leq f(nt, kt)$, where the last inequality follows from the definition of the Shallow-Cell Complexity of the instance \mathcal{I}'' . \square

Now, we state the known bounds on the Shallow-Cell Complexity of an MWDS instance induced by red and blue collections of pseudo-disks.

Theorem 2 ([4]). The Shallow-Cell Complexity of an MWDS instance induced by collections of pseudo-disks is at most $f(n, k) = O(nk^3)$.

Combining Theorems 1 and 2 and Lemma 1, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 3. *There exists a randomized polynomial time $O(t \log t)$ approximation algorithm for the Red-Blue Dominating Set induced by a set of t -pseudo-disks.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B})$ be the original instance and let x be an optimal LP solution. Define instance $\mathcal{I}' = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B}')$ and the corresponding LP solution x' as before. From Observation 1, we have that $\sum_{R_i \in \mathcal{R}} w_i x'_i \leq t \cdot \sum_{R_i \in \mathcal{R}} w_i x_i$. By Lemma 1 the shallow-cell complexity of \mathcal{I}' is $g(n, k) \leq f(nt, kt)$, where $f(n, k) = O(nk^3)$ by Theorem 2. Therefore, $g(n, k) \leq O(nt^4 k^3)$. Now, using the algorithm from Theorem 1 with $\phi(n) = O(t^4)$, we can round x' to an integral solution of cost at most $O(\log t) \cdot \sum_{R_i \in \mathcal{R}} w_i x'_i \leq O(t \log t) \cdot \sum_{R_i \in \mathcal{R}} w_i x_i$, where the inequality follows from Observation 1. \square

Remark 1. Suppose we have an instance of $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B})$ of generalized MWDS where each red object is a t_R -pseudo-disk and each blue object is a t_B -pseudo-disk. Then the preceding analysis can be extended to obtain an $O(t_B \log t_R)$ approximation. We note that for the analogous version of intervals, a $(t_B \cdot t_R)$ -approximation was obtained in [8].

Geometric MWSC with t -objects. Consider a Geometric MWSC instance (X, \mathcal{S}) , where X is a set of points, and \mathcal{S} is a collection of N sets induced by t -objects. Recall that the goal is to find a minimum-weight collection of t -objects \mathcal{S}' that covers the set of points X . Furthermore, suppose that the underlying geometric (1)-objects define a Set Cover instance with Shallow-Cell Complexity $f(n, k) = nk^c$, for constant c . This includes geometric objects such as intervals on a line, and (pseudo-)disks in the plane. Then, using similar arguments, one can bound the shallow-cell complexity of the MWSC instance by $O(nk^{ct^{c+1}})$. Then Theorem 1 implies an $O(\log t)$ -approximation.

If the underlying geometric objects are a set of fat triangles, then the Shallow-Cell Complexity can be bounded by $f(n, k) = n \log^* n \cdot k^c$, for some constant c [3, 9]. Using similar arguments, we can bound the Shallow-Cell Complexity of the MWSC instance by $f(nt, kt) = n \log^*(nt) \cdot t^{c+1} k^c$. Then, Theorem 1 implies an $O(\log(t^{c+1} \cdot \log^*(Nt))) = O(\log t + \log \log^* Nt)$ -approximation. Therefore, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 4. *There exists an $O(\log t)$ approximation algorithm for covering a set of points by t -objects, where the underlying geometric objects are intervals on a line, or (pseudo-)disks in the plane. If the underlying objects are fat triangles in plane, we get a $O(\log t + \log \log^* Nt)$ -approximation.*

We note that this result improves on t -approximation for covering points by t -intervals, which follows from the result of Hochbaum and Levin [18]. We also note that $O(\log t)$ is tight up to constant factors even for covering points by t -intervals, which follows from a reduction from the Set Cover problem as observed in [8].

3.2 Integrality of MWDS LP for Intervals

In this subsection, we prove that the MWDS LP for intervals is integral. Let $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B})$ be an MWDS instance, where \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{B} are collections of intervals on a line. Butman et al. [8] proved this using a primal-dual algorithm that constructs an integral solution of the same cost as the LP. We give a simpler proof of this fact by using structure of the constraint matrix.

First, we preprocess blue intervals such that no blue interval is completely contained inside another blue interval, and let \mathcal{I}' denote the resulting instance. Suppose $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ are two intervals such that $B_1 \subset B_2$. Then, any feasible integral solution must include a red interval R that intersects B_1 , and thus B_2 . Furthermore, the LP constraint corresponding to B_2 is implied by

the constraint corresponding to B_1 . Therefore, the feasible regions of the LP's corresponding to \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{I}' are also the same.

Now, in the following theorem we show that the constraint matrix of the LP corresponding to \mathcal{I}' satisfies the consecutive ones property, and thus it is totally unimodular. This implies that the LP corresponding to \mathcal{I}_1 (and therefore \mathcal{I}) is integral (see, e.g., [26]).

Theorem 5. *Let $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B})$ be an MWDS instance, where \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{B} are collections of (1)-intervals. Then, the MWDS LP is integral.*

Proof. Let A denote the constraint matrix corresponding to the preprocessed instance, where the rows (i.e., blue intervals) are sorted in the non-decreasing order of their left endpoints. We show that A has the consecutive ones property for any column.

Consider any column (i.e., a red interval) R . Let B_j and B_k denote the first (leftmost) and last (rightmost) blue intervals intersecting R in this order respectively. Note that $j \leq k$. Now, suppose for contradiction that there is an interval B_ℓ with $j < \ell < k$ that does not intersect R . Therefore, we have that $\text{Left}(B_j) < \text{Left}(B_\ell) \leq \text{Right}(B_\ell) < \text{Left}(R) \leq \text{Right}(B_j)$. Here, the third and fourth inequalities follow from the assumptions that $R \cap B_\ell = \emptyset$ and $R \cap B_j \neq \emptyset$ respectively. However, this implies that $B_\ell \subset B_j$, which is a contradiction. Thus, the column corresponding to R satisfies the consecutive ones property. \square

3.3 Hardness Results for MWDS

We show that it is NP-hard to obtain a $t - 1 - \epsilon$ approximation for MWDS problem for t -intervals, for any $t \geq 3$ and $\epsilon > 0$. The lower bound can be improved to $t - \epsilon$ for any $t \geq 2$ and $\epsilon > 0$, assuming the Unique Games Conjecture (UGC). In fact, this result follows even in the very restricted setting, where \mathcal{R} is a collection of points, and \mathcal{B} is a collection of t -points, i.e., a union of at most t distinct points. Note that this is a special case where \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{B} are collections of t -intervals.

Let (X, \mathcal{S}) be an f -uniform instance of MWSC. That is, any element in X is contained in exactly f sets of \mathcal{S} . We reduce this to the MWDS problem as follows. For every set $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$, we add a distinct red point R_i on a line, and set its weight equal to that of S_i . For any element $e_j \in X$, we add at most f blue points coinciding with points R_i , where $e_j \in S_i$. Note that a blue t -point is “covered” if we select a red point that coincides with its constituent t points. Thus, there is a one-to-one correspondence between a feasible solution to the original set cover instance, and a feasible solution to the MWDS instance. We have the following hardness results for the f -uniform MWSC problem.

Theorem 6. *It is NP-hard to obtain a $f - 1 - \epsilon$ approximation for f -uniform Set Cover, for any $f \geq 3$ and $\epsilon > 0$ [14].*

Assuming UGC, the lower bound can be improved to $f - \epsilon$ for any $f \geq 2$ and $\epsilon > 0$ [22].

Therefore, from the above reduction, we get the following hardness results for the MWDS problem.

Theorem 7. *It is NP-hard to obtain a $t - 1 - \epsilon$ approximation for the special case of MWDS, where \mathcal{R} is a set of points and \mathcal{B} is a set of t -points.*

Assuming UGC, the lower bound can be improved to $t - \epsilon$ for any $t \geq 2$ and $\epsilon > 0$.

4 Maximum Weight Independent Set

We consider MWIS of t -objects. Here, we are given a set $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ ³, where each $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$ is a t -object, and has a non-negative weight w_i . The goal is to find maximum weight independent set $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. That is, for any distinct $S_i, S_j \in \mathcal{S}'$, we must have $S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset$.

Let $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{S})$ denote the arrangement of \mathcal{S} , and let $\mathcal{V}(\mathcal{S})$ denote the set of vertices in $\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{S})$. We use the LP rounding algorithm for Maximum-Weight Independent Set from [10]. First, we state the LP relaxation from [10].

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{S_i \in \mathcal{S}} w_i x_i \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{S_i \ni p} x_i \leq 1, && \forall p \in \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{S}) && (3) \\ & && x_i \in [0, 1], && \forall S_i \in \mathcal{S} && (4) \end{aligned}$$

We have a simple observation that relates the union complexities of t -objects and the corresponding (1-)objects.

Observation 2. Let \mathcal{S} be a collection of t -objects, and suppose the collection of underlying (1-)objects has union complexity $u(\cdot)$. Then, the union complexity of any k objects in \mathcal{S} is at most $u(kt)$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ be any subset of t -objects. Let $\mathcal{R}' = \{r_i^{(k)} \in R_i : R_i \in \mathcal{R}\}$ denote the underlying set of (1-)objects. Note that $|\mathcal{R}'| \leq t \cdot |\mathcal{R}|$. Since the underlying collection of (1-)objects has union complexity $u(\cdot)$, the number of arcs on the boundary of \mathcal{R}' is at most $u(|\mathcal{R}'|) \leq u(t \cdot |\mathcal{R}|)$. \square

Chan and Har-Peled [10] give a randomized LP rounding algorithm with the following guarantee.

Theorem 8. *There is an $\Omega(n/u(n))$ -approximation algorithm for an MWIS instance, for a collection of n geometric objects with union complexity $u(\cdot)$.*

Combining Observation 2 and Theorem 8, we get the following result.

Theorem 9. *There is an $\Omega(n/u(nt))$ -approximation algorithm for an MWIS instance for an instance of t -objects, where the underlying (1-)objects have union complexity $u(\cdot)$.*

In particular, since pseudo-disks have linear union complexity [24], an $\Omega(1/t)$ -approximation follows for MWIS of t -pseudo-disks. As noted in the introduction, this result is tight up to constant factors even for the case of t -intervals.

Packing t -objects We consider a related problem called Maximum Weight Region Packing. We are given a collection of t -objects \mathcal{S} , and a set of points P . Each t -object S_i has a weight w_i and each point $p \in P$ has a capacity $c(p)$, which is a positive integer. The goal is to find a maximum-weight collection \mathcal{S}' of t -objects, such that for each point $p \in P$, the number of regions of \mathcal{S}' that contain p is at most $c(p)$. Note that MWIS is a special case when $P = \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{S})$ is the set of all points in arrangement and $c(p) = 1$ for each $p \in P$.

Extending the LP rounding algorithm of Chan and Har-Peled [10] for the MWIS problem, Ene et al. [15] gave an $\Omega((\frac{n}{u(n)})^{1/C})$ -approximation for Maximum Weight Region Packing problem,

³In this section, we assume that we are given the geometric representation of the t -objects in \mathcal{S} .

where C is the minimum capacity of any point. Using similar arguments as in MWIS, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 10. *There exists a polynomial $\Omega(1/t^{1/C})$ -approximation algorithm for Maximum Weight Region Packing with t -pseudo-disks.*

5 Concluding Remarks

In geometric settings, Quasi-Uniform Sampling has been used for Set Multicover [5], and other related ideas have been used for Partial Set Cover [19, 12]. Our results for MWDS and MWSC using t -objects can be extended to these settings, and we leave these extensions for a future version of the paper. We also note that even for the special case of MWDS of t -intervals, there is a gap between $O(t \log t)$ -approximation and a lower bound of $\Omega(t)$, as shown in Section 3. Resolving this gap is an interesting open question.

References

- [1] Anna Adamaszek, Sariel Har-Peled, and Andreas Wiese. Approximation schemes for independent set and sparse subsets of polygons. *CoRR*, abs/1703.04758, 2017. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1703.04758>, arXiv:1703.04758.
- [2] Anna Adamaszek and Andreas Wiese. Approximation schemes for maximum weight independent set of rectangles. In *54th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2013, 26-29 October, 2013, Berkeley, CA, USA*, pages 400–409, 2013. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2013.50>, doi:10.1109/FOCS.2013.50.
- [3] Boris Aronov, Mark de Berg, Esther Ezra, and Micha Sharir. Improved bounds for the union of locally fat objects in the plane. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 43(2):543–572, 2014. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/120891241>, doi:10.1137/120891241.
- [4] Boris Aronov, Anirudh Donakonda, Esther Ezra, and Rom Pinchasi. On Pseudo-disk Hypergraphs. *CoRR*, abs/1802.08799, 2018. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1802.08799>, arXiv:1802.08799.
- [5] Nikhil Bansal and Kirk Pruhs. Weighted geometric set multi-cover via quasi-uniform sampling. *JoCG*, 7(1):221–236, 2016. URL: <https://doi.org/10.20382/jocg.v7i1a11>, doi:10.20382/jocg.v7i1a11.
- [6] Reuven Bar-Yehuda, Magnús M. Halldórsson, Joseph Naor, Hadas Shachnai, and Irina Shapira. Scheduling split intervals. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 36(1):1–15, 2006. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539703437843>, doi:10.1137/S0097539703437843.
- [7] Reuven Bar-Yehuda and Dror Rawitz. Using fractional primal-dual to schedule split intervals with demands. *Discrete Optimization*, 3(4):275–287, 2006. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disopt.2006.05.010>, doi:10.1016/j.disopt.2006.05.010.
- [8] Ayelet Butman, Danny Hermelin, Moshe Lewenstein, and Dror Rawitz. Optimization problems in multiple-interval graphs. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 6(2):40:1–40:18, 2010. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1721837.1721856>, doi:10.1145/1721837.1721856.

- [9] Timothy M. Chan, Elyot Grant, Jochen Könemann, and Malcolm Sharpe. Weighted capacitated, priority, and geometric set cover via improved quasi-uniform sampling. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2012, Kyoto, Japan, January 17-19, 2012*, pages 1576–1585, 2012. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611973099.125>, doi:10.1137/1.9781611973099.125.
- [10] Timothy M. Chan and Sarel Har-Peled. Approximation Algorithms for Maximum Independent Set of Pseudo-Disks. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 48(2):373–392, 2012. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00454-012-9417-5>, doi:10.1007/s00454-012-9417-5.
- [11] Chandra Chekuri, Kenneth L. Clarkson, and Sarel Har-Peled. On the set multicover problem in geometric settings. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 9(1):9:1–9:17, 2012. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2390176.2390185>, doi:10.1145/2390176.2390185.
- [12] Chandra Chekuri, Kent Quanrud, and Zhao Zhang. On approximating partial set cover and generalizations. *CoRR*, abs/1907.04413, 2019. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.04413>, arXiv:1907.04413.
- [13] Kenneth L. Clarkson and Kasturi R. Varadarajan. Improved approximation algorithms for geometric set cover. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 37(1):43–58, 2007. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00454-006-1273-8>, doi:10.1007/s00454-006-1273-8.
- [14] Irit Dinur, Venkatesan Guruswami, Subhash Khot, and Oded Regev. A new multilayered PCP and the hardness of hypergraph vertex cover. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 34(5):1129–1146, 2005. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539704443057>, doi:10.1137/S0097539704443057.
- [15] Alina Ene, Sarel Har-Peled, and Benjamin Raichel. Geometric packing under nonuniform constraints. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 46(6):1745–1784, 2017. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/120898413>, doi:10.1137/120898413.
- [16] Matt Gibson and Imran A. Pirwani. Algorithms for dominating set in disk graphs: Breaking the $\log n$ barrier - (extended abstract). In *Algorithms - ESA 2010, 18th Annual European Symposium, Liverpool, UK, September 6-8, 2010. Proceedings, Part I*, pages 243–254, 2010. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15775-2_21, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-15775-2_21.
- [17] Jerrold R. Griggs and Douglas B. West. Extremal values of the interval number of a graph. *SIAM J. Matrix Analysis Applications*, 1(1):1–7, 1980. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/0601001>, doi:10.1137/0601001.
- [18] Dorit S. Hochbaum and Asaf Levin. Cyclical scheduling and multi-shift scheduling: Complexity and approximation algorithms. *Discrete Optimization*, 3(4):327–340, 2006. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disopt.2006.02.002>, doi:10.1016/j.disopt.2006.02.002.
- [19] Tanmay Inamdar and Kasturi R. Varadarajan. On partial covering for geometric set systems. In *34th International Symposium on Computational Geometry, SoCG 2018, June 11-14, 2018, Budapest, Hungary*, pages 47:1–47:14, 2018. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.SoCG.2018.47>, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.SoCG.2018.47.
- [20] Frank Kammer and Torsten Tholey. Approximation algorithms for intersection graphs. *Algorithmica*, 68(2):312–336, 2014. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-012-9671-1>, doi:10.1007/s00453-012-9671-1.

- [21] Frank Kammer, Torsten Tholey, and Heiko Voepel. Approximation Algorithms for Intersection Graphs. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques, 13th International Workshop, APPROX 2010, and 14th International Workshop, RANDOM 2010, Barcelona, Spain, September 1-3, 2010. Proceedings*, pages 260–273, 2010. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15369-3_20; <https://dblp.org/rec/bib/conf/approx/KammerTV> doi:10.1007/978-3-642-15369-3_20.
- [22] Subhash Khot and Oded Regev. Vertex cover might be hard to approximate to within 2-epsilon. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 74(3):335–349, 2008. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2007.06.019>, doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2007.06.019.
- [23] Nabil H. Mustafa and Kasturi R. Varadarajan. Epsilon-approximations and epsilon-nets. *CoRR*, abs/1702.03676, 2017. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1702.03676>, arXiv:1702.03676.
- [24] János Pach, Pankaj K Agarwal, and Micha Sharir. State of the union (of geometric objects). Technical report, American Mathematical Society, 2008.
- [25] Aniket Basu Roy, Sathish Govindarajan, Rajiv Raman, and Saurabh Ray. Packing and covering with non-piercing regions. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 60(2):471–492, 2018. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00454-018-9983-2>, doi:10.1007/s00454-018-9983-2.
- [26] Alexander Schrijver. *Combinatorial optimization: polyhedra and efficiency*, volume 24. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- [27] William P Thurston. *The geometry and topology of three-manifolds*. Princeton University Princeton, NJ, 1979.
- [28] Kasturi R. Varadarajan. Weighted geometric set cover via quasi-uniform sampling. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2010, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, 5-8 June 2010*, pages 641–648, 2010. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1806689.1806777>, doi:10.1145/1806689.1806777.
- [29] Yuli Ye and Allan Borodin. Elimination graphs. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 8(2):14:1–14:23, 2012. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2151171.2151177>, doi:10.1145/2151171.2151177.