

Harmonic Algorithms for Packing d -dimensional Cuboids Into Bins

Eklavya Sharma

Department of Computer Science and Automation
Indian Institute of Science, Bengaluru.
eklavyas@iisc.ac.in

Abstract

We study *harmonic-based* algorithms for the d -dimensional (dD) generalizations of three classical geometric packing problems: geometric bin packing (BP), strip packing (SP), and geometric knapsack (KS). Caprara [8] studied a harmonic-based algorithm HDH_k , that has an asymptotic approximation ratio of T_∞^{d-1} (where $T_\infty \approx 1.691$) for dD BP and dD SP when items are not allowed to be rotated. We give fast and simple harmonic-based algorithms with asymptotic approximation ratios of T_∞^{d-1} , T_∞^d and $(1-\varepsilon)3^{-d}$ for dD SP, dD BP and dD KS, respectively, when orthogonal rotations are allowed about all or a subset of axes. This gives the first approximation algorithm for dD KS for $d > 3$. Furthermore, we provide a more sophisticated harmonic-based algorithm, which we call HGaP_k , that is $T_\infty^{d-1}(1+\varepsilon)$ -asymptotic-approximate for dD BP for the rotational case. This gives an approximation ratio of $2.860 + \varepsilon$ for 3D BP with rotations, which improves upon the current best-known algorithm.

In addition, we study *multiple-choice packing* problems that generalize the rotational case. Here we are given n sets of dD cuboidal items and we have to choose exactly one (resp. at most one for the knapsack variant) item from each set and then pack the chosen items. All our algorithms also work for multiple-choice packing problems.

Acknowledgements. I want to thank my advisor, Prof. Arindam Khan, for his valuable comments, and Arka Ray for helpful suggestions.

1 Introduction

Packing of rectangular and cuboidal objects is a fundamental problem in computer science, mathematics, and operations research. Packing problems find numerous applications in practice, e.g., physical packing of concrete 3D objects during storage or transportation [7], cutting prescribed 2D pieces from cloth or metal sheet while minimizing the waste [17], etc. In this paper, we study packing of d -dimensional (dD) cuboidal items (for $d \geq 2$).

Let I be a set of n number of dD cuboidal items, where each item has length at most one in each dimension. A feasible packing of items into a dD cuboid is a packing where items are placed inside the cuboid parallel to the axes without any overlapping. A dD *unit cube* is a dD cuboid of length one in each dimension. In the dD bin-packing problem (dBP), we have to compute a feasible packing of I (without rotating the items) into the minimum number of bins that are dD unit cubes. In the dD strip-packing problem (dSP), we have to compute a feasible packing of I (without rotating the items) into a dD cuboid (called a strip) that has length one in the first $d-1$ dimensions and has the minimum possible length (called height) in the d^{th} dimension. In the dD knapsack problem (dKS), we are given a set I of items, and a profit $p(i)$ for each item

$i \in I$. We have to compute a maximum-profit packing of a subset of I (without rotating the items) into a dD unit cube (called a knapsack). Let $\text{opt}_{d\text{BP}}(I)$ denote the minimum number of bins needed to pack I . Let $\text{opt}_{d\text{SP}}(I)$ denote the minimum height of a strip needed to pack I . We will collectively refer to $d\text{BP}$, $d\text{SP}$ and $d\text{KS}$ as dD packing problems.

These problems are NP-hard, as they generalize bin-packing [9] and knapsack [23] problems. Thus, we study simple approximation algorithms. For packing problems, the worst-case approximation ratio usually occurs only for *small* pathological instances. Thus, the standard performance measure is the asymptotic approximation ratio (AAR). For an algorithm \mathcal{A} , AAR is defined as: $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \{\mathcal{A}(I) / \text{opt}(I) \mid \text{opt}(I) = n\}$, where \mathcal{I} is the set of all problem instances. $\mathcal{A}(I)$, $\text{opt}(I)$ are the values corresponding to \mathcal{A} and the optimal algorithm, resp., on I .

Coffman et al. [10] initiated the study of approximation algorithms for rectangle packing. They studied shelf-based packing algorithms (we formally define *shelf-based* later) such as First-Fit Decreasing Height (FFDH), Next-Fit Decreasing Height (NFDH). In his seminal paper, Caprara [8] devised a polynomial-time algorithm for $d\text{SP}$ and $d\text{BP}$ called HDH_k (Harmonic Decreasing Height), that takes a parameter $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and returns a shelf-based strip-packing of height at most $T_k^{d-1} \text{opt}_{d\text{SP}}(I) + k^{d-1}$, where T_k is a decreasing function of k and $T_\infty := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_k \approx 1.691$. This strip-packing can be converted to a bin-packing of I that uses at most $(1 + \varepsilon) T_k^{d-1} \text{opt}_{d\text{BP}}(I) + O(1)$ bins, for any $\varepsilon > 0$. The algorithm HDH_k was based on an extension of the harmonic algorithm [25] for 1BP. For online $d\text{BP}$ ($d > 2$) there are harmonic-based T_∞^d -asymptotic approximation algorithms [14, 11], which are optimal for $O(1)$ memory algorithms.

One of the limitations of HDH_k is that it does not allow rotation of items. This is in contrast to some real-world problems, like packing boxes into shipping containers ($d = 3$), where items can often be rotated orthogonally, i.e. 90 degree rotation around all or a subset of axes [1, 27]. Orientation constraints may sometimes limit the vertical orientation of a box to one dimension (“This side up!”) or to two (of three) dimensions (e.g., long but low and narrow box should not be placed on its smallest surface). These constraints are introduced to deter goods and packaging from being damaged and to ensure the stability of the load. One of our primary contributions is presenting variants of HDH_k that work for generalizations of $d\text{BP}$, $d\text{KS}$ and $d\text{SP}$ that capture the notion of orthogonal rotation of items.

1.1 Prior Work

For 2BP, Bansal et al. [3] obtained AAR of $T_\infty + \varepsilon$ even for the case with rotations, using a more sophisticated algorithm that used properties of harmonic rounding. Then there has been a series of improvements [3, 19] culminating with the present best AAR of 1.406 [5], for both the cases with and without orthogonal rotations. Bansal et al. [6] showed $d\text{BP}$ is APX-hard, even for $d = 2$. They also gave an asymptotic PTAS for $d\text{BP}$ where all items are dD squares.

For 2SP, an asymptotic PTAS was given by Kenyon and Rémila [24]. Jansen and van Stee [21] extended this to the case with orthogonal rotations. For 3SP, when rotations are not allowed, Bansal et al. [4] gave a harmonic-based algorithm achieving AAR of $T_\infty + \varepsilon$. Recently, this has been improved to $1.5 + \varepsilon$ [20]. Miyazawa and Wakabayashi [26] studied 3SP and 3BP when rotations are allowed, and gave algorithms with AAR 2.64 and 4.89, respectively. Epstein and van Stee [15] gave an improved AAR of 2.25 and 4.5 for 3SP and 3BP with rotations, respectively.

Surprisingly, HDH_k still gives the best-known AAR for $d\text{SP}$ and $d\text{BP}$ when $d > 3$.

For $d\text{KS}$, we are not aware of any algorithm for $d > 3$. For 2KS, Jansen and Zhang [22] gave a

$(\frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon)$ approximation. This has been recently improved to $\frac{9}{17} - \varepsilon$ [16] and works for both the cases with and without rotations. For 3KS, Diedrich et al. [13] have given $\frac{1}{7} - \varepsilon$ for the case without rotations. Furthermore, for the case where rotation by 90 degrees, either around the z-axis or around all axes, is permitted, they obtain algorithms with approximation ratios $\frac{1}{6} - \varepsilon$ and $\frac{1}{5} - \varepsilon$, respectively.

1.2 Generalizations of Packing Problems

We will now define multiple-choice packing problems. They generalize d BP, d SP and d KS, and capture the notion of orthogonal rotation of items. This perspective will be helpful in designing algorithms for the rotational case. In the d D multiple-choice bin-packing problem (d MCBP), we're given a set $\mathcal{I} = \{I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n\}$, where for each j , I_j is a set of items, henceforth called an *itemset*. We have to pick exactly one item from each itemset and pack those items into the minimum number of bins. We can similarly define the d D multiple-choice strip-packing problem (d MCSP). In the d D multiple-choice knapsack problem (d MCKS), we're given \mathcal{I} as input, and each item $i \in I_j$ has a profit $p(i)$. We have to pick at most one item from each itemset and pack those items into a d D bin such that the total profit is maximized. Similar notions are studied in the scheduling of malleable or moldable jobs [28, 18].

We can model rotation using multiple-choice packing: Given a set I of items, for each item $i \in I$, create an itemset I_i that contains all allowed orientations of i . Then the optimal solution to $\mathcal{I} := \{I_i : i \in I\}$ will tell us how to rotate and pack items in I .

1.3 Our Contributions

After the introduction of harmonic algorithm for online 1BP by Lee and Lee [25], many variants and extensions have found widespread usage in multidimensional packing problems [3, 4] and they serve as the basis for many “state of the art” algorithms. There are multiple reasons for their extensive usage. First, they are simple, fast, and easy to implement. For example, among algorithms for 3SP and 2BP with practical running time, harmonic-based algorithms provide the best AAR. All the present algorithms with better approximation guarantee over harmonic-based algorithms, are impractical. Second, one can exploit nice structural properties in their analysis. The packing of the solution is shelf-based, which makes the analysis easier. Also, harmonic-based algorithms use weight functions in their analysis, which is easy to extend. For online algorithms, using more sophisticated weight functions, there have been improvements for 1BP [2] by algorithms that are closely related to harmonic. This makes harmonic-based algorithms, in 1D and 2D packing, to be elegant.

In our work, we extend and generalize harmonic-based algorithms to d D multiple-choice variants of bin-packing, strip-packing and knapsack. We believe the multiple-choice packing problems are important natural generalizations of packing problems and may be of independent interest.

In Section 3, we give a slightly different analysis of the HDH_k algorithm. This helps us extract a reusable subroutine for designing harmonic d D packing algorithms. In Section 3.1, we extend HDH_k to get an $O(N + n \log n)$ -time algorithm for d MCSP having an AAR of T_k^{d-1} , where n is the number of itemsets and N is total number of items across all the n itemsets. In Section 4, we show an $O(N + n \log n)$ -time algorithm for d MCBP, called fullh_k , having an AAR of T_k^d . To the best of our knowledge, these are the first approximation algorithms for d SP and d BP for $d > 3$ when items can be orthogonally rotated.

In Section 5, we show an algorithm for d MCBP, called HGAP_k , having an AAR of $T_k^{d-1}(1 + \varepsilon)$ and having a running time of $N^{O(1/\varepsilon^2)} n^{(1/\varepsilon)^{O(1/\varepsilon)}}$. For $d \geq 3$, this matches the present best

AAR for the case where rotations are forbidden. Also, for large k , this gives an AAR of roughly $T_\infty^2 \approx 2.86$ for 3D bin-packing when orthogonal rotations are allowed, which is an improvement over the previous best AAR of 4.5 [15], an improvement after fourteen years.

In Section 6, for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, we show an $O(Nn^2/\varepsilon)$ -time algorithm for d MCKS, called HDH-KS, having an approximation ratio of $(1 - \varepsilon)3^{-d}$. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first approximation algorithm for d KS for $d > 3$. This is also the first instance where harmonic-based algorithms are used for knapsack problems.

All of our algorithms produce shelf-based packings. An interesting property of harmonic algorithms is that they are, in some sense, optimal for shelf-based packing. Formally, Caprara [8] showed that no shelf-based algorithm for 2SP or 2BP can get an AAR better than $T_\infty \approx 1.69103$, and his HDH $_k$ algorithm achieves an AAR of T_k^{d-1} for d SP and d BP. In Appendix C, we extend that result to show that no shelf-based algorithm for d SP or d BP can get an AAR better than T_∞^{d-1} .

As harmonic algorithms are ubiquitous in bin packing, we expect our results will have applications in other related problems.

2 Preliminaries

Let $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For a set X , define $\text{sum}(X) := \sum_{x \in X} x$. For an n -dimensional vector \mathbf{v} , define $\text{sum}(\mathbf{v}) := \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{v}_i$. For a set $X \subseteq I$ of items and any function $f : I \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, $f(X)$ is defined to be $\sum_{i \in X} f(i)$, unless stated otherwise.

A unit strip is a cuboid that has length one in the first $d - 1$ dimensions. The length of a d D item i in the j^{th} dimension is denoted by $\ell_j(i)$. Define $\text{vol}(i) := \prod_{j=1}^d \ell_j(i)$. For a d D cuboid i , call the first $d - 1$ dimensions *base dimensions* and call the d^{th} dimension *height*. For a set I of items, $|I|$ is the number of items in I . Let $|P|$ denote the number of bins used by a packing P of items into bins.

2.1 Shelf-Based Packing

A packing of 2D items in a bin (or strip) is said to be *shelf-based* iff the bin can be decomposed into regions, called shelves, using horizontal cuts, and the bottom edge of each item touches the bottom edge of some shelf. See Fig. 1 for an example. Next-Fit Decreasing Height (NFDH) and First-Fit Decreasing Height (FFDH) [10] are well-known shelf-based algorithms for 2BP and 2SP.




Figure 1: An example of shelf-based packing for $d = 2$ with 3 shelves.

The definition of shelf-based packing can be extended to d D for $d \geq 1$. For $d = 1$, every packing is said to be a shelf-based packing. For $d \geq 2$, for a d D cuboid, there are two faces of the cuboid that are perpendicular to the d^{th} dimension. The face with the smaller d^{th} coordinate is called

the *base* of the cuboid. A packing of d D items into a bin is shelf-based iff the d D bin can be split into d D shelves using hyperplanes perpendicular to the d^{th} dimension, and the base of each item is placed on the base of some shelf.

A packing of d D items into a bin is *recursive-shelf-based* iff the packing is shelf-based and the packing of the bases of items on the base of each shelf is a $(d-1)$ D recursive-shelf-based bin-packing. (For $d=1$, every packing is said to be recursive-shelf-based.)

The critical observation here is that placing d D items onto the base of a d D shelf is equivalent to packing $(d-1)$ D items into a $(d-1)$ D bin. This helps us reduce d BP to $(d-1)$ BP, $(d-1)$ BP to $(d-2)$ BP, and so on. The algorithm HDH $_k$ by Caprara [8] outputs a recursive-shelf-based packing by using this strategy.

2.2 Multiple-Choice Packing

Let \mathcal{I} be a set of itemsets. Define $\text{flat}(\mathcal{I})$ to be the union of all itemsets in \mathcal{I} .

Let K be a set of items that contains exactly one item from each itemset in \mathcal{I} . Formally, for each itemset $I \in \mathcal{I}$, $|K \cap I| = 1$. Then K is called an *assortment* of \mathcal{I} . Let $\Psi(\mathcal{I})$ denote the set of all assortments of \mathcal{I} .

In d MCCBP, given an input instance \mathcal{I} , we have to select an assortment $K \in \Psi(\mathcal{I})$ and output a bin-packing of K , such that the number of bins used is minimized. Therefore, $\text{opt}_{d\text{MCCBP}}(\mathcal{I}) = \min_{K \in \Psi(\mathcal{I})} \text{opt}_{d\text{BP}}(K)$.

Similarly, for d MCCSP, $\text{opt}_{d\text{MCCSP}}(\mathcal{I}) = \min_{K \in \Psi(\mathcal{I})} \text{opt}_{d\text{SP}}(K)$.

2.3 Harmonic Weighting Function

For an integer constant $k \geq 3$, Caprara [8] defined $f_k : [0, 1] \mapsto [0, 1]$ for their algorithm as

$$f_k(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{q} & x \in \left(\frac{1}{q+1}, \frac{1}{q}\right] \text{ for } q \in [k-1] \\ \frac{k}{k-2}x & x \leq \frac{1}{k} \end{cases}$$

f_k was originally defined and studied by Lee and Lee [25] for their online algorithm for 1BP, except that they used $k/(k-1)$ instead of $k/(k-2)$. Define $\text{type}_k : [0, 1] \mapsto [k]$ as

$$\text{type}_k(x) := \begin{cases} q & x \in \left(\frac{1}{q+1}, \frac{1}{q}\right] \text{ for } q \in [k-1] \\ k & x \leq \frac{1}{k} \end{cases}$$

Definition 1. $g : [0, 1] \mapsto [0, 1]$ is a *weighting function* iff for all $x \in [0, 1]^m$

$$\sum_{i=1}^m x_i \leq 1 \implies \sum_{i=1}^m g(x_i) \leq 1$$

(*Weighting functions are also called dual feasible functions (DFFs) [8]*).

Define T_k to be the smallest positive constant such that $H_k(x) := f_k(x)/T_k$ is a weighting function. We call H_k the *harmonic weighting function*. We can efficiently compute T_k as a function of k using ideas from [25]. Table 1 lists the values of T_k for the first few k . It can also be proven that T_k is a decreasing function of k and $T_\infty := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} T_k \approx 1.6910302$.

For a d D cuboid i , define $f_k(i)$ to be the cuboid whose length is $f_k(\ell_j(i))$ in the j^{th} dimension. For a set I of d D cuboids, let $f_k(I) := \{f_k(i) : i \in I\}$. Similarly define $H_k(i)$ and $H_k(I)$. Define

k	3	4	5	6	7	∞
T_k	3	2	$11/6 = 1.8\bar{3}$	$7/4 = 1.75$	$26/15 = 1.7\bar{3}$	≈ 1.6910302

Table 1: Table of values for T_k .

$\text{type}(i)$ to be a d -dimensional vector whose j^{th} component is $\text{type}_k(\ell_j(i))$. Note that there can be at most k^d different values of $\text{type}(i)$. Sometimes, for the sake of convenience, we may express $\text{type}(i)$ as an integer in $[k^d]$.

Define $\tilde{f}_k(i)$ to be the cuboid \tilde{i} where $\ell_j(\tilde{i}) := f_k(\ell_j(i))$ for $j \in [d-1]$ and $\ell_d(\tilde{i}) := \ell_d(i)$. Similarly define $\tilde{f}_k(I)$, $\tilde{H}_k(i)$ and $\tilde{H}_k(I)$. Also define $\text{btype}(i)$ (called *base type*) to be a $(d-1)$ -dimensional vector whose j^{th} component is $\text{type}_k(\ell_j(i))$ for $j \in [d-1]$.

Theorem 1. *Let I be a set of dD items that can be packed into a bin. Let g_1, g_2, \dots, g_d be weighting functions. For $i \in I$, define $g(i)$ as the item whose length is $g_j(\ell_j(i))$ in the j^{th} dimension. Then $\{g(i) : i \in I\}$ can be packed into a dD bin (without rotating the items).*

Theorem 1 is proved in Appendix D.

Corollary 1.1. *For a set of I of dD items, $\text{vol}(f_k(I)) \leq T_k^d \text{opt}_{d\text{BP}}(I)$.*

Proof. Let $m := \text{opt}_{d\text{BP}}(I)$. Let J_j be the items in the j^{th} bin in the optimal bin-packing of I . By Theorem 1 and because H_k is a weighting function, $H_k(J_j)$ fits in a bin. Therefore,

$$\text{vol}(f_k(I)) = \sum_{j=1}^m T_k^d \text{vol}(H_k(J_j)) \leq \sum_{j=1}^m T_k^d = T_k^d \text{opt}_{d\text{BP}}(I) \quad \square$$

Corollary 1.2. *For a set I of dD items, $\text{vol}(\tilde{f}_k(I)) \leq T_k^{d-1} \text{opt}_{d\text{SP}}(I)$.*

Proof. I fits in a unit strip of height $\text{opt}_{d\text{SP}}(I)$. Let I' be the items obtained by scaling each item's height by $1/\text{opt}_{d\text{SP}}(I)$. Then I' fits in a unit cube.

Since H_k is a weighting function, $\tilde{H}_k(I')$ fits in a unit cube by Theorem 1. Therefore, $\tilde{H}_k(I)$ can be packed into a unit strip of height $\text{opt}_{d\text{SP}}(I)$. Therefore, $\text{vol}(\tilde{f}_k(I)) \leq T_k^{d-1} \text{vol}(\tilde{H}_k(I)) \leq T_k^{d-1} \text{opt}_{d\text{SP}}(I)$. \square

3 Harmonic Algorithm for Strip-Packing

Caprara [8] gave an algorithm for $d\text{SP}$, which we call HDH-SP_k . From their algorithm, we extract out a subroutine HDH-unit-pack_k (Algorithm 8) and show how to use it to design HDH-SP_k (Algorithm 1). HDH-unit-pack_k is a useful tool for designing harmonic algorithms, and we will later use it in our algorithms for $d\text{MCCBP}$ (Sections 4 and 5). We then give an analysis of HDH-SP_k that is slightly different from Caprara [8]. This will help us design an algorithm for $d\text{MCSP}$ using HDH-SP_k as a subroutine.

The algorithm $\text{HDH-unit-pack}_k^{[t]}(I, d)$ takes a *sequence* I of dD items such that all items have type t (i.e., $\forall i \in I, \text{type}(i) = t$) and $\text{vol}(f_k(I - \{\text{last}(I)\})) < 1$ (here $\text{last}(I)$ is the last item in sequence I). It returns a recursive-shelf-based packing of I into a single dD bin. The design of HDH-unit-pack_k and its correctness can be inferred from lemma 4.1 in [8]. For the sake of completeness, in Appendix B, we give a complete description of HDH-unit-pack_k , prove its correctness and show that it has a running time of $O(n \log n)$, where $n := |I|$.

Algorithm 1 HDH-SP_k(I): Returns a recursive-shelf-based strip-packing of d D items I ($d \geq 2$).

```

1: Let  $P$  be an empty list.
2: for each btype  $t$  do
3:    $I^{[t]} = \{i \in I : \text{btype}(i) = t\}$ .
4:   Sort items in  $I^{[t]}$  in non-increasing order of their length in the  $d^{\text{th}}$  dimension.
5:   while  $|I^{[t]}| > 0$  do
6:     Find  $J$ , the smallest prefix of  $I^{[t]}$  such that  $J = I^{[t]}$  or  $\text{vol}(f_k(J^{(d-1)})) \geq 1$ .
7:      $S = \text{HDH-unit-pack}_k^{[t]}(J, d-1)$  //  $S$  is a  $d$ D shelf containing items  $J$ .
8:     Append  $S$  to the list  $P$ .
9:     Remove  $J$  from  $I^{[t]}$ .
10:  end while
11: end for
12: Return the strip-packing formed by the shelves  $P$ .
```

For a d D item i , define $i^{(j)}$ to be the j D item obtained by ignoring all dimensions of i other than the first j . For a set I of d D items, let $I^{(j)} := \{i^{(j)} : i \in I\}$.

See Algorithm 1 for a description of HDH-SP_k. It is easy to see that HDH-SP_k(I) has a running time of $O(n \log n)$, where $n := |I|$.

Theorem 2. *The height of the strip-packing produced by HDH-SP_k(I) is less than $Q + \text{vol}(\tilde{f}_k(I))$, where Q is the number of distinct btypes of items (so $Q \leq k^{d-1}$).*

Proof. Let there be $p^{[q]}$ shelves of btype q produced by HDH-SP_k(I). Let $S_j^{[q]}$ be the set of items in the j^{th} shelf of btype q . Define $\ell_d(S_j^{[q]}) := \max_{i \in S_j^{[q]}} \ell_d(i)$ to be the height of shelf $S_j^{[q]}$.

Since items in $I^{[q]}$ were sorted in decreasing order of ℓ_d , $\forall i \in S_j^{[q]}, \ell_d(i) \geq \ell_d(S_{j+1}^{[q]})$. Given the way we choose prefixes, $\text{vol}(f_k(S_j^{[q](d-1)})) \geq 1$ for $j \in [p-1]$.

$$\text{vol}(\tilde{f}_k(S_j^{[q]})) \geq \text{vol}(f_k(S_j^{[q](d-1)})) \ell_d(S_{j+1}^{[q]}) \geq \ell_d(S_{j+1}^{[q]}) \quad (1)$$

Total height of the strip-packing is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{q=1}^Q \sum_{j=1}^{p^{[q]}} \ell_d(S_j^{[q]}) &\leq \sum_{q=1}^Q \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{p^{[q]}-1} \ell_d(S_{j+1}^{[q]}) \right) && \text{(since } \ell_d(S_1^{[q]}) \leq 1) \\ &\leq Q + \sum_{q=1}^Q \sum_{j=1}^{p^{[q]}-1} \text{vol}(\tilde{f}_k(S_j^{[q]})) && \text{(by (1))} \\ &< Q + \sum_{q=1}^Q \sum_{j=1}^{p^{[q]}} \text{vol}(\tilde{f}_k(S_j^{[q]})) = Q + \text{vol}(\tilde{f}_k(I)) && \square \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 2.1. HDH-SP_k(I) packs I into a strip of height less than $Q + T_k^{d-1} \text{opt}_{\text{dSP}}(I)$, where Q is the number of distinct btypes of items.

Proof. Follows from Theorem 2 and Corollary 1.2. □

3.1 HDH-SP_k for dMCSP

Theorem 3. Let \mathcal{I} be a dMCSP instance. Let $\widehat{K} := \{\operatorname{argmin}_{i \in I} \operatorname{vol}(\widetilde{f}_k(i)) : I \in \mathcal{I}\}$, i.e. \widehat{K} is the assortment obtained by picking from each itemset the item i having the minimum value of $\operatorname{vol}(\widetilde{f}_k(i))$. Then the height of the strip-packing produced by HDH-SP_k(\widehat{K}) is less than $Q + T_k^{d-1} \operatorname{opt}_{d\text{MCSP}}(\mathcal{I})$, where Q is the number of distinct btypes of items in $\operatorname{flat}(\mathcal{I})$ (so $Q \leq k^{d-1}$).

Proof. For any assortment K , $\operatorname{vol}(\widetilde{f}_k(\widehat{K})) \leq \operatorname{vol}(\widetilde{f}_k(K))$. Let K^* be the assortment in an optimal packing of \mathcal{I} . By Theorem 2 and Corollary 1.2, the height of the strip-packing produced by HDH-SP_k(\widehat{K}) is less than

$$Q + \operatorname{vol}(\widetilde{f}_k(\widehat{K})) \leq Q + \operatorname{vol}(\widetilde{f}_k(K^*)) \leq Q + T_k^{d-1} \operatorname{opt}_{d\text{SP}}(K^*) = Q + T_k^{d-1} \operatorname{opt}_{d\text{MCSP}}(\mathcal{I}) \quad \square$$

Let $N := |\operatorname{flat}(\mathcal{I})|$ and $n := |\mathcal{I}|$. Then we can find \widehat{K} in $O(N)$ time and compute HDH-SP_k(\widehat{K}) in $O(n \log n)$ time. Therefore, we get a T_k^{d-1} -asymptotic-approximate algorithm for dMCSP that runs in $O(N + n \log n)$ time.

4 Fast and Simple Algorithm for dMCBP (fullh_k)

We will now describe an algorithm for dBP called the *full-harmonic algorithm* (fullh_k, see Algorithm 2). We will then extend it to dMCBP.

Algorithm 2 fullh_k(I): Returns a recursive-shelf-based bin-packing of dD items I .

```

1: Let  $P$  be an empty list.
2: for each type  $t$  do
3:    $I^{[t]} = \{i \in I : \operatorname{type}(i) = t\}$ .
4:   while  $|I^{[t]}| > 0$  do
5:     Find  $J$ , the smallest prefix of  $I^{[t]}$  such that  $J = I^{[t]}$  or  $\operatorname{vol}(f_k(J)) \geq 1$ .
6:      $B = \text{HDH-unit-pack}_k^{[t]}(J, d)$ . //  $B$  is a packing of  $J$  into a  $dD$  bin.
7:     Append  $B$  to the list  $P$ .
8:     Remove  $J$  from  $I^{[t]}$ .
9:   end while
10: end for
11: return the list  $P$  of bins.

```

Theorem 4. Number of bins used by fullh_k(I) is less than $Q + \operatorname{vol}(f_k(I))$, where Q is the number of distinct types of items (so $Q \leq k^d$).

Proof. Suppose fullh_k(I) produces $m^{[q]}$ bins having items of type q . Let $B_j^{[q]}$ be the j^{th} of these bins. Given the way we choose prefixes, $\operatorname{vol}(f_k(B_j^{[q]})) \geq 1$ for $j \in [m^{[q]} - 1]$.

Let $I^{[q]}$ be the set of items in I of type q . Hence, $\operatorname{vol}(f_k(I^{[q]})) = \sum_{j=1}^{m^{[q]}} \operatorname{vol}(f_k(B_j^{[q]})) > (m^{[q]} - 1)$. Therefore, total number of bins used is $\sum_{q=1}^Q m^{[q]} < \sum_{q=1}^Q (1 + \operatorname{vol}(f_k(I^{[q]}))) \leq Q + \operatorname{vol}(f_k(I))$. \square

Corollary 4.1. Number of bins used by fullh_k(I) is less than $Q + T_k^d \operatorname{opt}_{d\text{BP}}(I)$, where Q is the number of distinct types of items.

Proof. Follows from Theorem 4 and Corollary 1.1. \square

Theorem 5. Let \mathcal{I} be a d MCBP instance. Let $\widehat{K} := \{\operatorname{argmin}_{i \in I} \operatorname{vol}(f_k(i)) : I \in \mathcal{I}\}$, i.e. \widehat{K} is the assortment obtained by picking from each itemset the item i having the minimum value of $\operatorname{vol}(f_k(i))$. Then the number of bins used by $\operatorname{fullh}_k(\widehat{K})$ is less than $Q + T_k^d \operatorname{opt}_{d\text{MCBP}}(\mathcal{I})$, where Q is the number of distinct types of items in $\operatorname{flat}(\mathcal{I})$ (so $Q \leq k^d$).

Proof. For any assortment K , $\operatorname{vol}(f_k(\widehat{K})) \leq \operatorname{vol}(f_k(K))$. Let K^* be the assortment in an optimal packing of \mathcal{I} . By Theorem 4 and Corollary 1.1, the number of bins used by $\operatorname{fullh}_k(\widehat{K})$ is less than

$$Q + \operatorname{vol}(f_k(\widehat{K})) \leq Q + \operatorname{vol}(f_k(K^*)) \leq Q + T_k^d \operatorname{opt}_{d\text{BP}}(K^*) = Q + T_k^d \operatorname{opt}_{d\text{MCBP}}(\mathcal{I}) \quad \square$$

Let $N := |\operatorname{flat}(\mathcal{I})|$ and $n := |\mathcal{I}|$. Then we can find \widehat{K} in $O(N)$ time and compute $\operatorname{fullh}_k(\widehat{K})$ in $O(n \log n)$ time. Therefore, we get a T_k^d -asymptotic-approximate algorithm for d MCBP that runs in $O(N + n \log n)$ time.

5 Better Algorithm for d MCBP (HGaP $_k$)

Here we will describe a $T_k^{d-1}(1 + \varepsilon)$ -asymptotic-approximate algorithm for d MCBP that is based on HDH $_k$ and Lueker and de la Vega's APTAS for 1BP [12]. We call our algorithm *Harmonic Guess-and-Pack* (HGaP $_k$). This improves upon the T_k^d -asymptotic-approximate algorithm fullh_k .

In [8], Caprara showed that we can get a $T_k^{d-1}(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approx algorithm for d BP by using HDH-SP $_k$ to pack the items into shelves and then packing the shelves into bins using the APTAS for 1BP. HGaP $_k$ works the other way around, i.e., we first guess the heights of the shelves and the way they are packed into bins, and then we compute an assortment of the input that can be packed into the shelves.

Definition 2. For a dD item i , let $h(i) := \ell_d(i)$, $w(i) := \prod_{j=1}^{d-1} \ell_j(i)$ and $a(i) := w(i)h(i) = \operatorname{vol}(\widetilde{f}_k(i))$. Let $\mathbf{wround}(i)$ be a rectangle of height $h(i)$ and width $w(i)$. For a set X of dD items, define $w(X) := \sum_{i \in X} w(i)$ and $\mathbf{wround}(X) := \{\mathbf{wround}(i) : i \in X\}$.

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, the algorithm HGaP $_k(\mathcal{I}, \varepsilon)$ (see Algorithm 3) returns a bin-packing of \mathcal{I} , where \mathcal{I} is a set of dD itemsets. HGaP $_k$ first converts \mathcal{I} to a set $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ of 2D itemsets. It then computes P_{best} , which is a *structured* bin-packing of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ (we formally define *structured* later). Finally, it uses the algorithm `inflate` to convert P_{best} into a bin-packing of the dD itemsets \mathcal{I} , where $|\operatorname{inflate}(P_{\text{best}})|$ is very close to $|P_{\text{best}}|$. This approach of converting items to 2D, packing them, and then converting back to dD is very useful, because most of our analysis is about how to compute a structured 2D packing, and a packing of 2D items is easier to visualize and reason about than a packing of dD items.

In a shelf-based bin-packing, items are packed into *shelves*, and the shelves are packed into bins, where a shelf is a rectangle of width 1. A structured bin-packing is a shelf-based bin-packing where the heights of the shelves satisfy some additional properties. The algorithm `guess-shelves` guesses the number and heights of shelves and computes a structured packing P of those shelves into bins. Then for each packing P , the algorithm `choose-and-pack`($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P, \delta$) tries to pack an assortment of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ into the shelves in P plus maybe one additional shelf. If `choose-and-pack` succeeds, it returns the bin-packing \overline{P} . Otherwise, it returns `null`. P_{best} is the value of \overline{P} with the minimum number of bins.

We show that HGaP $_k$ is $T_k^{d-1}(1 + \varepsilon)$ -asymptotic-approximate by proving that for some $P^* \in \operatorname{guess-shelves}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, \delta)$, we have $|P^*| \lesssim T_k^{d-1} \operatorname{opt}(\mathcal{I})(1 + \varepsilon)$ and `choose-and-pack`($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P^*, \delta$) is not `null`.

Algorithm 3 $\text{HGaP}_k(\mathcal{I}, \varepsilon)$: Returns a bin-packing of dD itemsets \mathcal{I} , where $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

```

1: Let  $\delta := \varepsilon/(2 + \varepsilon)$ .
2:  $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} = \{\text{wround}(I) : I \in \mathcal{I}\}$ 
3: Initialize  $P_{\text{best}}$  to null.
4: for  $P \in \text{guess-shelves}(\mathcal{I}, \delta)$  do
5:    $\overline{P} = \text{choose-and-pack}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P, \delta)$ 
6:   if  $\overline{P}$  is not null and ( $P_{\text{best}}$  is null or  $|\overline{P}| \leq |P_{\text{best}}|$ ) then
7:      $P_{\text{best}} = \overline{P}$ 
8:   end if
9: end for
10: return  $\text{inflate}(P_{\text{best}})$ 

```

We will now precisely define *structured* bin-packing and state the main theorems about HGaP_k .

5.1 Structured Packing

Definition 3 (Slicing). *Slicing a 1D item i is the operation of replacing it by items i_1 and i_2 such that $\text{size}(i_1) + \text{size}(i_2) = \text{size}(i)$.*

Slicing a rectangle i using a vertical cut is the operation of replacing i by two rectangles i_1 and i_2 where $h(i) = h(i_1) = h(i_2)$ and $w(i) = w(i_1) + w(i_2)$. Slicing i using a horizontal cut is the operation of replacing i by two rectangles i_1 and i_2 where $w(i) = w(i_1) = w(i_2)$ and $h(i) = h(i_1) + h(i_2)$.

Definition 4 (Shelf-based δ -fractional packing). *Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be a constant. Let K be a set of rectangular items. Items in $K_L := \{i \in K : h(i) > \delta\}$ are said to be ‘ δ -large’ and items in $K_S := K - K_L$ are said to be ‘ δ -small’. A δ -fractional bin-packing of K is defined to be a packing of K into bins where items in K_L can be sliced (recursively) using vertical cuts only, and items in K_S can be sliced (recursively) using both horizontal and vertical cuts.*

A shelf is a rectangle of width 1 into which we can pack items such that the bottom edge of each item in the shelf touches the bottom edge of the shelf. A shelf can itself be packed into a bin. A δ -fractional bin-packing of K is said to be shelf-based iff (all slices of) all items in K_L are packed into shelves, the shelves are packed into the bins, and items in K_S are packed outside the shelves (and inside the bins). Packing of items into a shelf S is said to be tight iff the top edge of some item (or slice) in S touches the top edge of S .

Definition 5 (Structured packing). *Let K be a set of rectangles and let P be a packing of empty shelves into bins. Let H be the set of heights of shelves in P (note that H is not a multiset, i.e., we only consider distinct heights of shelves). Then P is said to be structured for (K, δ) iff $|H| \leq \lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil$ and each element in H is the height of some δ -large item in K .*

A shelf-based δ -fractional packing of K is said to be structured iff the shelves in the packing are structured for (K, δ) . Define $\text{sopt}_\delta(K)$ to be the number of bins in the optimal structured δ -fractional packing of K .

HGaP_k relies on the following key structural theorem, that we prove in Appendix A.2.

Theorem 6 (Structural theorem). *Let I be a set of dD items. Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be a constant. Then $\text{sopt}_\delta(\text{wround}(I)) < T_k^{d-1}(1 + \delta) \text{opt}_{d\text{BP}}(I) + \lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil + 1 + \delta$.*

Our proof of Theorem 6 uses the idea of linear grouping from Lueker and Vega [12] and techniques from Caprara [8] that show how to bound the minimum number of bins for a 1BP instance using a weighting function derived from its linear programming relaxation.

5.2 Subroutines

5.2.1 guess-shelves

The algorithm `guess-shelves`($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, \delta$) takes a set $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ of 2D itemsets and a constant $\delta \in (0, 1)$ as input. We will design `guess-shelves` so that it satisfies the following theorem.

Theorem 7. `guess-shelves`($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, \delta$) returns all possible packings of empty shelves into at most $|\widehat{\mathcal{I}}|$ bins such that each packing is structured for $(\text{flat}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}), \delta)$. `guess-shelves`($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, \delta$) returns at most $T := (N^{\lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil} + 1)(n + 1)^R$ packings, where $N := |\text{flat}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}})|$, $n := |\widehat{\mathcal{I}}|$, and $R := \binom{\lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil + \lceil 1/\delta \rceil - 1}{\lceil 1/\delta \rceil - 1} \leq (1 + \lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil)^{1/\delta}$. Its running time is $O(T)$.

Designing `guess-shelves` can be easily done using standard techniques. For the sake of completeness, we precisely describe `guess-shelves` and prove Theorem 7 in Appendix A.3.

5.2.2 choose-and-pack

`choose-and-pack`($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P, \delta$) takes as input a set $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ of 2D itemsets, a constant $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and a packing P of empty shelves into bins that is structured for $(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, \delta)$. In Appendix A.4, we give a full description of `choose-and-pack` and prove the following three theorems about it.

Theorem 8. If the output \overline{P} of `choose-and-pack`($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P, \delta$) is not `null`, then \overline{P} is a shelf-based δ -fractional packing of some assortment \overline{K} of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $|\overline{P}| \leq |P| + 1$ and the distinct shelf heights in \overline{P} are the same as that in P .

Theorem 9. Let \widehat{K} be any assortment of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ and let P be any structured δ -fractional bin-packing of \widehat{K} . Then the output of `choose-and-pack`($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P, \delta$) is not `null`.

Theorem 10. `choose-and-pack`($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P, \delta$) runs in time $O(Nn^{2\lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil})$, where $N := |\text{flat}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}})|$ and $n := |\widehat{\mathcal{I}}|$.

`choose-and-pack` roughly works by rounding up the widths of items and packing them using dynamic programming.

5.2.3 inflate

In Appendix A.5, we describe `inflate` and prove the following theorem about it.

Theorem 11. Let I be a set of dD items. Let there be Q distinct base types in I . Let P be a shelf-based δ -fractional packing of $\text{wround}(I)$ where the shelves have t distinct heights. Then `inflate`(P) runs in $O(|I| \log |I|)$ time and returns a packing of I into less than $|P|/(1 - \delta) + tQ + 1 + \delta Q/(1 - \delta)$ bins.

Roughly, `inflate`(P) works as follows: It first slightly modifies the packing P so that items of different base types are in different shelves and δ -small items are no longer sliced using horizontal cuts. Then it gets a dD bin-packing by converting each 2D shelf to a dD shelf using `HDH-unit-packk`.

Now that we have mentioned the guarantees of all the subroutines used by `HGaPk`, we can prove the correctness and running time of `HGaPk`.

5.3 Correctness and Running Time of HGaP_k

Theorem 12. *The number of bins used by HGaP_k(\mathcal{I}, ε) to pack \mathcal{I} is less than*

$$T_k^{d-1}(1 + \varepsilon) \text{opt}_{d\text{MCCBP}}(\mathcal{I}) + \left\lceil \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right)^2 \right\rceil \left(Q + 1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) + 3 + (Q + 3) \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

Here Q is the number of distinct base types in $\text{flat}(\mathcal{I})$.

Proof. Let K^* be the assortment in an optimal bin-packing of \mathcal{I} . Let $\widehat{K}^* = \text{wround}(K^*)$. Let P^* be the optimal structured δ -fractional bin-packing of \widehat{K}^* . Then by Theorem 7, $P^* \in \text{guess-shelves}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, \delta)$, and every $P \in \text{guess-shelves}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, \delta)$ is a packing of shelves into bins that is structured for $(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, \delta)$. $|P^*| = \text{sopt}_\delta(\widehat{K}^*)$ by the definition of sopt .

For $\overline{P}^* = \text{choose-and-pack}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P^*, \delta)$, we get that \overline{P}^* is not null by Theorem 9. For every $P \in \text{guess-shelves}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, \delta)$, Theorem 8 says that $\overline{P} = \text{choose-and-pack}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P, \delta)$ is a shelf-based δ -fractional packing of some assortment of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $|\overline{P}| \leq |P| + 1$ and \overline{P} is structured for $(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, \delta)$. Therefore, $|P_{\text{best}}| \leq \text{sopt}_\delta(\widehat{K}^*) + 1$ and P_{best} has at most $\lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil$ distinct shelf heights.

By Theorem 11, we get that

$$|\text{inflate}(P_{\text{best}})| < \frac{\text{sopt}_\delta(\widehat{K}^*)}{1 - \delta} + \left\lceil \frac{1}{\delta^2} \right\rceil Q + 1 + \frac{\delta Q + 1}{1 - \delta}$$

By Theorem 6 and the fact that $\text{opt}_{d\text{BP}}(K^*) = \text{opt}_{d\text{MCCBP}}(\mathcal{I})$, we get

$$\text{sopt}_\delta(\widehat{K}^*) < T_k^{d-1}(1 + \delta) \text{opt}_{d\text{MCCBP}}(\mathcal{I}) + \lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil + 1 + \delta$$

Therefore, $|\text{inflate}(P_{\text{best}})|$ is less than

$$\begin{aligned} & T_k^{d-1} \frac{1 + \delta}{1 - \delta} \text{opt}_{d\text{MCCBP}}(\mathcal{I}) + \left\lceil \frac{1}{\delta^2} \right\rceil \left(Q + \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \right) + 3 + \frac{\delta(3 + Q)}{1 - \delta} \\ & = T_k^{d-1}(1 + \varepsilon) \text{opt}_{d\text{MCCBP}}(\mathcal{I}) + \left\lceil \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right)^2 \right\rceil \left(Q + 1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) + 3 + (Q + 3) \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 13. *HGaP_k(\mathcal{I}, ε) runs in time $O(N^{1 + \lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil} n^{R + 2 \lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil})$, where $n := |\widehat{\mathcal{I}}|$, $N := |\text{flat}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}})|$, $\delta := \varepsilon/(2 + \varepsilon)$ and $R := \binom{\lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil + \lceil 1/\delta \rceil - 1}{\lceil 1/\delta \rceil - 1} \leq (1 + \lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil)^{1/\delta}$.*

Proof. Follows from Theorems 7, 10 and 11. □

Appendix A.6 gives hints on improving the running time of HGaP_k.

6 Harmonic Algorithm for dMCKS

We'll see a fast and simple algorithm HDH-NF_k(I) (Algorithm 4) for dBP that we'll use to design an algorithm for dMCKS.

Note that HDH-NF_k(I) runs in $O(n \log n)$ time.

Theorem 14. *HDH-NF_k(I) uses at most $Q + \lceil 2 \text{vol}(\widetilde{f}_k(I)) \rceil$ bins, where Q is the number of distinct btypes of items.*

Algorithm 4 HDH-NF_k(I): Returns a recursive-shelf-based bin-packing of dD items I ($d \geq 2$).

- 1: Let P be the list of shelves output by HDH-SP_k(I).
 - 2: Let P' be an empty list.
 - 3: **for** each btype q **do**
 - 4: Let $S_1^{[q]}, S_2^{[q]}, \dots, S_{p^{[q]}}^{[q]}$ be the shelves in P of btype q , in decreasing order of height.
 - 5: Pack $S_1^{[q]}$ in a dD bin.
 - 6: For $j \geq 2$, add $S_j^{[q]}$ to P' .
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: Interpreting each shelf $S_j^{[q]}$ in P' as a 1D item of size $\ell_d(S_j^{[q]})$, pack the shelves into dD bins using Next-Fit.
-

Proof. For each $q \in [Q]$, $S_1^{[q]}$ occupies one bin.

As per Eq. (1) in the proof of Theorem 2, for all $t \leq p^{[q]} - 1$, we get $\text{vol}(\tilde{f}_k(S_t^{[q]})) \geq \ell_d(S_{t+1}^{[q]})$.

Let H be the total height of the shelves in P' . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 H &= \sum_{q=1}^Q \sum_{t=1}^{p^{[q]}-1} \ell_d(S_{t+1}^{[q]}) \leq \sum_{q=1}^Q \sum_{t=1}^{p^{[q]}-1} \text{vol}(\tilde{f}_k(S_t^{[q]})) && \text{(by (1))} \\
 &< \sum_{q=1}^Q \sum_{t=1}^{p^{[q]}} \text{vol}(\tilde{f}_k(S_t^{[q]})) = \text{vol}(\tilde{f}_k(I))
 \end{aligned}$$

Next-Fit guarantees that for a 1BP instance J , number of bins used is at most $\lceil 2 \text{vol}(J) \rceil$. So for the shelves in P' , we use $\lceil 2H \rceil$ bins. The total number of bins used is therefore $Q + \lceil 2H \rceil \leq Q + \lceil 2 \text{vol}(\tilde{f}_k(I)) \rceil$. \square

By Corollary 1.2 and Theorem 14, we get that HDH-NF_k is $2T_k^{d-1}$ -asymptotic-approximate.

We will now give an FPTAS for 1MCKS, and use it along with HDH-NF₃ to get an algorithm for d MCKS, called HDH-KS (see Algorithm 5).

Lemma 15. *Let \mathcal{I} be a 1MCKS instance. Let $n := |\mathcal{I}|$ and $N := |\text{flat}(\mathcal{I})|$. Let $p(i)$ be the profit of item i . Then for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, we can find a solution of profit more than $(1 - \varepsilon) \text{opt}_{1\text{MCKS}}(\mathcal{I}, p)$ in $O(Nn^2/\varepsilon)$ time.*

We give a brief proof sketch below, which is very similar to the analysis of the FPTAS for 1KS. For completeness, we give a full proof in Appendix E.

Proof. Let $0 < \delta < 1$, $\hat{p}(i) := \lfloor p(i)/\delta \rfloor$, $J := \text{argopt}_{1\text{MCKS}}(\mathcal{I}, p)$, $\hat{J} := \text{argopt}_{1\text{MCKS}}(\mathcal{I}, \hat{p})$, and $p_{\max} := \max_{i \in \text{flat}(\mathcal{I})} p(i)$. Then $p(\hat{J}) > p(J) - n\delta$ and \hat{J} can be computed in $O(Nnp_{\max}/\delta)$ time using dynamic programming. Set $\delta := \varepsilon p_{\max}/n$. Then $p(\hat{J}) > (1 - \varepsilon)p(J) = (1 - \varepsilon) \text{opt}_{1\text{MCKS}}(\mathcal{I}, p)$, so output \hat{J} . \square

Note that HDH-KS runs in $O(Nn^2/\varepsilon)$ time.

Theorem 16. HDH-KS is $(1 - \varepsilon)3^{-d}$ -approximate.

Proof. Let I be a set of dD items. Suppose $S \subseteq I$ can be packed into a bin. Then by Theorem 1, $\hat{S} = \{\text{vol}(\tilde{H}_3(i)) : i \in S\}$ can also be packed into a bin. Therefore, $\text{opt}_{1\text{MCKS}}(\hat{\mathcal{I}}) \geq \text{opt}_{d\text{MCKS}}(\mathcal{I})$.

Algorithm 5 HDH-KS(\mathcal{I}): algorithm for d MCKS.

- 1: $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} = \{\{\text{vol}(\widehat{H}_3(i)) : i \in I\} : I \in \mathcal{I}\}$. // Reduction to 1MCKS.
 - 2: Let \widehat{J} be a $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution to the 1MCKS instance $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ output by the algorithm of Lemma 15.
 - 3: Let J be the items of \mathcal{I} corresponding to \widehat{J} .
 - 4: Let $[J_1, J_2, \dots, J_b]$ be the bin-packing of J produced using HDH-NF $_3$.
 - 5: $j_{\max} = \underset{j=1}{\overset{b}{\text{argmax}}} p(J_j)$
 - 6: **return** $J_{j_{\max}}$.
-

The algorithm of Lemma 15 gives us \widehat{J} such that $p(\widehat{J}) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \text{opt}_{1\text{MCKS}}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}})$. HDH-NF $_k$ packs J into $b \leq 3^{d-1} + \lceil 2T_3^{d-1} \text{vol}(\widehat{H}_3(J)) \rceil \leq 3^d$ bins. Given the way we choose j_{\max} ,

$$p(J_{j_{\max}}) \geq \frac{p(J)}{b} = \frac{p(\widehat{J})}{b} \geq \frac{(1 - \varepsilon) \text{opt}_{1\text{MCKS}}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}})}{b} \geq \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{3^d} \text{opt}_{d\text{MCKS}}(\mathcal{I}) \quad \square$$

References

- [1] Mauro Maria Baldi, Guido Perboli, and Roberto Tadei. The three-dimensional knapsack problem with balancing constraints. *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 218(19):9802–9818, 2012. doi:10.1016/j.amc.2012.03.052.
- [2] János Balogh, József Békési, György Dósa, Leah Epstein, and Asaf Levin. A new and improved algorithm for online bin packing. In *ESA*, pages 5:1–5:14, 2018. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.ESA.2018.5.
- [3] Nikhil Bansal, Alberto Caprara, and Maxim Sviridenko. A new approximation method for set covering problems, with applications to multidimensional bin packing. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(4):1256–1278, 2010. doi:10.1137/080736831.
- [4] Nikhil Bansal, Xin Han, Kazuo Iwama, Maxim Sviridenko, and Guochuan Zhang. A harmonic algorithm for the 3d strip packing problem. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 42(2):579–592, 2013. doi:10.1137/070691607.
- [5] Nikhil Bansal and Arindam Khan. Improved approximation algorithm for two-dimensional bin packing. In *SODA*, pages 13–25, 2014. doi:10.1137/1.9781611973402.2.
- [6] Nikhil Bansal and Maxim Sviridenko. New approximability and inapproximability results for 2-dimensional bin packing. In *SODA*, pages 196–203, 2004.
- [7] Andreas Bortfeldt and Gerhard Wäscher. Constraints in container loading—a state-of-the-art review. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 229(1):1–20, 2013. doi:10.1016/j.ejor.2012.12.006.
- [8] Alberto Caprara. Packing d -dimensional bins in d stages. *Mathematics of Operations Research - MOR*, 33:203–215, 02 2008. doi:10.1287/moor.1070.0289.
- [9] Edward G. Coffman, János Csirik, Gábor Galambos, Silvano Martello, and Daniele Vigo. Bin packing approximation algorithms: survey and classification. In *Handbook of combinatorial optimization*, pages 455–531. Springer New York, 2013.
- [10] Edward G. Coffman, Michael R. Garey, David S. Johnson, and Robert E. Tarjan. Performance bounds for level-oriented two-dimensional packing algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 9:808–826, 1980. doi:10.1137/0209062.

- [11] János Csirik and André van Vliet. An on-line algorithm for multidimensional bin packing. *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 13(3):149–158, 1993. doi:10.1016/0167-6377(93)90004-Z.
- [12] W Fernandez De La Vega and George S. Lueker. Bin packing can be solved within $1 + \varepsilon$ in linear time. *Combinatorica*, 1(4):349–355, 1981. doi:10.1007/BF02579456.
- [13] Florian Diedrich, Rolf Harren, Klaus Jansen, Ralf Thöle, and Henning Thomas. Approximation algorithms for 3d orthogonal knapsack. *Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, 23(5):749, 2008. doi:10.1007/s11390-008-9170-7.
- [14] Leah Epstein and Rob van Stee. Optimal online algorithms for multidimensional packing problems. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 35(2):431–448, 2005. doi:10.1137/S0097539705446895.
- [15] Leah Epstein and Rob van Stee. This side up! *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 2(2):228–243, 2006. doi:10.1145/1150334.1150339.
- [16] Waldo Gálvez, Fabrizio Grandoni, Sandy Heydrich, Salvatore Ingala, Arindam Khan, and Andreas Wiese. Approximating geometric knapsack via l-packings. In *FOCS*, pages 260–271, 2017. doi:10.1109/FOCS.2017.32.
- [17] Paul C. Gilmore and Ralph E. Gomory. A linear programming approach to the cutting-stock problem. *Operations research*, 9(6):849–859, 1961. doi:10.1287/opre.9.6.849.
- [18] Klaus Jansen. A $(3/2 + \varepsilon)$ approximation algorithm for scheduling moldable and non-moldable parallel tasks. In *SPAA*, pages 224–235, 2012. doi:10.1145/2312005.2312048.
- [19] Klaus Jansen and Lars Prädél. New approximability results for two-dimensional bin packing. In *SODA*, pages 919–936, 2013. doi:10.1007/s00453-014-9943-z.
- [20] Klaus Jansen and Lars Prädél. A new asymptotic approximation algorithm for 3-dimensional strip packing. In *SOFSEM*, pages 327–338, 2014. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-04298-5_29.
- [21] Klaus Jansen and Rob van Stee. On strip packing with rotations. In *STOC*, pages 755–761. ACM, 2005. doi:10.1145/1060590.1060702.
- [22] Klaus Jansen and Guochuan Zhang. On rectangle packing: maximizing benefits. In *SODA*, pages 204–213, 2004.
- [23] Hans Kellerer, Ulrich Pferschy, and David Pisinger. *Knapsack problems*. Springer, 2004.
- [24] Claire Kenyon and Eric Rémila. Approximate strip packing. In *FOCS*, pages 31–36, 1996. doi:10.1109/SFCS.1996.548461.
- [25] C. C. Lee and D. T. Lee. A simple on-line bin-packing algorithm. *J. ACM*, 32(3):562–572, July 1985. doi:10.1145/3828.3833.
- [26] Flavio Keidi Miyazawa and Yoshiko Wakabayashi. Three-dimensional packings with rotations. *Computers & Operations Research*, 36(10):2801–2815, 2009. doi:10.1016/j.cor.2008.12.015.
- [27] Y. G. Stoyan and Andrey M. Chugay. Packing different cuboids with rotations and spheres into a cuboid. *Advances in Decision Sciences*, 2014, 2014.
- [28] Hu Zhang and Klaus Jansen. Scheduling malleable tasks. In *Handbook of Approximation Algorithms and Metaheuristics*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2007.

A Details of the HGaP_k Algorithm

This section gives details of the subroutines used by HGaP_k. It also proves the theorems claimed in Section 5.

A.1 Preliminaries

Definition 6. Let I_1 and I_2 be sets of 1D items. Then I_1 is defined to be a predecessor of I_2 (denoted as $I_1 \preceq I_2$) iff there exists a one-to-one mapping $\pi : I_1 \mapsto I_2$ such that $\forall i \in I_1, i \leq \pi(i)$.

Observation 17. Let $I_1 \preceq I_2$ where π is the corresponding one-to-one mapping. Then we can obtain a packing of I_1 from a packing of I_2 , by packing each item $i \in I_1$ in the place of $\pi(i)$. Hence, $\text{opt}(I_1) \leq \text{opt}(I_2)$.

Definition 7 (Canonical shelving). Let I be a set of rectangles. Order the items in I in non-increasing order of height (break ties arbitrarily but deterministically) and greedily pack them into tight shelves, slicing items using vertical cuts if necessary. The set of shelves thus obtained is called the canonical shelving of I , and is denoted by $\text{can-shelv}(I)$. (The canonical shelving is unique because ties are broken deterministically.)

Suppose a set I of rectangular items is packed into a set J of shelves. Then we can interpret J as a 1BP instance where the height of each shelf is the size of the corresponding 1D item. We'll now prove that the canonical shelving is optimal, i.e., any shelf-based bin-packing of items can be obtained by first computing the canonical shelving and then packing the shelves into bins like a 1BP instance.

Lemma 18. Let I be a set of rectangles packed inside shelves J . Let $J^* := \text{can-shelv}(I)$. Then $J^* \preceq J$.

Proof. We say that a shelf is full if the total width of items in a shelf is 1. Arrange the shelves J in non-increasing order of height, and arrange the items I in non-increasing order of height. Then try to pack I into J using the following greedy algorithm: For each item i , pack the largest possible slice of i into the first non-full shelf and pack the remaining slice (if any) in the next shelf. If this greedy algorithm succeeds, then within each shelf of J , there is a shelf of J^* , so $J^* \preceq J$. We'll now prove that this greedy algorithm always succeeds.

For the sake of proof by contradiction, assume that the greedy algorithm failed, i.e., for an item (or slice) i there was a non-full shelf S but $h(i) > h(S)$. Let I' be the items (and slices) packed before i and J' be the shelves before S . Therefore, $w(I') = |J'|$.

All items in I' have height at least $h(i)$, so all shelves in J' have height at least $h(i)$. All shelves after J' have height less than $h(i)$. Therefore, J' is exactly the set of shelves of height at least $h(i)$.

In the packing P , $I' \cup \{i\}$ can only be packed into shelves of height at least $h(i)$, so $w(I') + w(i) \leq |J'|$. But this contradicts $w(I') = |J'|$. Therefore, the greedy algorithm cannot fail. \square

Lemma 19. Consider the inequality $x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n \leq s$, where for each $j \in [n]$, $x_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Let N be the number of solutions to this inequality. Then $N = \binom{s+n}{n} \leq (s+1)^n$.

Proof. The proof of $N = \binom{s+n}{n}$ is a standard result in combinatorics.

To prove $N \leq (s+1)^n$, note that we can choose each $x_j \in \{0, 1, \dots, s\}$ independently. \square

A.2 Structural Theorem

Let I be a set of d D items. Let $\widehat{I} := \text{wround}(I)$. Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be a constant. Let $\widehat{I}_L := \{i \in \widehat{I} : h(i) > \delta\}$ and $\widehat{I}_S := \widehat{I} - \widehat{I}_L$. Let $J := \text{can-shelv}(\widehat{I}_L)$. Let $m := |J|$. We can interpret \widehat{I}_S as a single sliceable 1D item of size $a(\widehat{I}_S)$.

We will show the existence of a structured δ -fractional packing of \widehat{I} into at most $T_k^{d-1}(1 + \delta) \text{opt}_{d\text{BP}}(I) + \lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil + 1 + \delta$ bins. This would prove Theorem 6.

Definition 8 (Linear grouping). *Arrange the 1D items J in non-increasing order of size and number them from 1 to m . Let $q := \lfloor \delta \text{size}(J) \rfloor + 1$ and $t := \lceil m/q \rceil$. Let J_1 be the first q items, J_2 be the next q items, and so on. More formally, for $j \in [t]$, let J_j be the items numbered from $(j-1)q + 1$ to $\min(jq, m)$. Then $0 \leq |J_t| \leq q$ and for $j \in [t-1]$ we have $|J_j| = q$. J_j is called the j^{th} linear group of J .*

Let h_j be the size of the first item in J_j . Let $h_{t+1} := 0$. For $j \in [t-1]$, let $J_j^{(\text{lo})}$ be the items obtained by decreasing the height of items in J_j to h_{j+1} . For $j \in [t]$, let $J_j^{(\text{hi})}$ be the items obtained by increasing the height of items in J_j to h_j .

Let $J^{(\text{lo})} := \bigcup_{j=1}^{t-1} J_j^{(\text{lo})}$ and $J^{(\text{hi})} := \bigcup_{j=1}^t J_j^{(\text{hi})}$. We call $J^{(\text{lo})}$ a down-rounding of J and $J^{(\text{hi})}$ an up-rounding of J .

Lemma 20. $t \leq \lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil$.

Proof. Since each shelf in J has height more than δ , $\text{size}(J) > |J|\delta$.

$$t := \left\lceil \frac{|J|}{\lfloor \delta \text{size}(J) \rfloor + 1} \right\rceil \leq \left\lceil \frac{\text{size}(J)/\delta}{\delta \text{size}(J)} \right\rceil = \left\lceil \frac{1}{\delta^2} \right\rceil \quad \square$$

Lemma 21. $J^{(\text{lo})} \preceq J \preceq J^{(\text{hi})} \preceq J^{(\text{lo})} \cup J_1^{(\text{hi})}$.

Proof. For $j \in [t-1]$, $J_j^{(\text{lo})} \preceq J_j$. Therefore, $J^{(\text{lo})} \preceq J$. For $j \in [t]$, $J_j \preceq J_j^{(\text{hi})}$. Therefore, $J \preceq J^{(\text{hi})}$. For $j \in [t-1]$, all (1D) items in both $J_j^{(\text{lo})}$ and $J_{j+1}^{(\text{hi})}$ have height h_{j+1} , and $|J_{j+1}| \leq q-1 = |J_j|$. Therefore, $J_{j+1}^{(\text{hi})} \preceq J_j^{(\text{lo})}$ and hence

$$J^{(\text{hi})} = J_1^{(\text{hi})} \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{t-1} J_{j+1}^{(\text{hi})} \preceq J_1^{(\text{hi})} \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{t-1} J_j^{(\text{lo})} = J_1^{(\text{hi})} \cup J^{(\text{lo})} \quad \square$$

Lemma 22. $\text{size}(J) < 1 + a(\widehat{I}_L)$.

Proof. In the canonical shelving of \widehat{I}_L , let S_j be the j^{th} shelf. Let $h(S_j)$ be the height of S_j . Since the shelves are tight, items in S_j have height at least $h(S_{j+1})$. So, $a(S_j) \geq h(S_{j+1})$ and

$$\text{size}(J) = \sum_{j=1}^{|J|} h(S_j) \leq 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{|J|-1} h(S_{j+1}) \leq 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{|J|-1} a(S_j) < 1 + a(\widehat{I}_L) \quad \square$$

Lemma 23. $\text{sopt}_\delta(\widehat{I}) < \text{opt}(J^{(\text{lo})} \cup \widehat{I}_S) + \delta a(\widehat{I}_L) + (1 + \delta)$.

Proof. By the definition of can-shelv, \widehat{I}_L can be packed into J . By Lemma 21, \widehat{I}_L can be packed into $J^{(\text{hi})}$. By Lemma 20, the number of distinct sizes in $J^{(\text{hi})}$ is at most $\lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil$. So, the optimal

1D bin-packing of $J^{(\text{hi})} \cup \widehat{I}_S$ will give us a structured δ -fractional bin-packing of \widehat{I} . Hence, $\text{sopt}_\delta(\widehat{I}) \leq \text{opt}(J^{(\text{hi})} \cup \widehat{I}_S)$.

By Lemma 21 and Observation 17 we get

$$\text{opt}(J^{(\text{hi})} \cup \widehat{I}_S) \leq \text{opt}(J^{(\text{lo})} \cup J_1^{(\text{hi})} \cup \widehat{I}_S) \leq \text{opt}(J^{(\text{lo})} \cup \widehat{I}_S) + \text{opt}(J_1^{(\text{hi})})$$

By Lemma 22,

$$\text{opt}(J_1^{(\text{hi})}) \leq |J_1^{(\text{hi})}| \leq q \leq 1 + \delta \text{size}(J) < 1 + \delta(1 + a(\widehat{I}_L)) \quad \square$$

A.2.1 LP for Packing $J^{(\text{lo})} \cup \widehat{I}_S$

We will formulate an integer linear program for bin-packing $J^{(\text{lo})} \cup \widehat{I}_S$.

Let $C \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{t-1}$ such that $h_C := \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} C_j h_{j+1} \leq 1$. Then C is called a configuration. C represents a set of 1D items that can be packed into a bin and where C_j items are from $J_j^{(\text{lo})}$. Let \mathcal{C} be the set of all configurations. We can pack at most $\lceil 1/\delta \rceil - 1$ items into a bin because $h_t > \delta$. By Lemma 19, we get $|\mathcal{C}| \leq \binom{\lceil 1/\delta \rceil - 1 + t - 1}{t-1} \leq \lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil^{1/\delta}$.

Let x_C be the number of bins packed according to configuration C . Bin-packing $J^{(\text{lo})} \cup \widehat{I}_S$ is equivalent to finding the optimal integer solution to the following linear program, which we'll denote as $\text{LP}(\widehat{I})$.

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{C}|}} \quad & \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} x_C \\ \text{where} \quad & \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} C_j x_C \geq q \quad \forall j \in [t-1] \\ & \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} (1 - h_C) x_C \geq a(\widehat{I}_S) \\ & x_C \geq 0 \quad \forall C \in \mathcal{C} \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 24. $\text{opt}(J^{(\text{lo})} \cup \widehat{I}_S) \leq \text{opt}(\text{LP}(\widehat{I})) + t$.

Proof. Let x^* be an optimal extreme-point solution to $\text{LP}(\widehat{I})$. By rank-lemma, x^* has at most t non-zero entries. Let \widehat{x} be a vector where $\widehat{x}_C := \lceil x_C^* \rceil$. Then \widehat{x} is an integral solution to $\text{LP}(\widehat{I})$ and $\sum_C \widehat{x}_C < t + \sum_C x_C^* = \text{opt}(\text{LP}(\widehat{I})) + t$. \square

The dual of $\text{LP}(\widehat{I})$, denoted by $\text{DLP}(\widehat{I})$, is

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^{t-1}, z \in \mathbb{R}} \quad & a(\widehat{I}_S)z + q \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} y_j \\ \text{where} \quad & \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} C_j y_j + (1 - h_C)z \leq 1 \quad \forall C \in \mathcal{C} \\ & z \geq 0 \text{ and } y_j \geq 0 \quad \forall j \in [t-1] \end{aligned}$$

A.2.2 Weighting Function for a Feasible Solution to $\text{DLP}(\widehat{I})$

We will now see how to obtain a monotonic weighting function $\eta : [0, 1] \mapsto [0, 1]$ from a feasible solution to $\text{DLP}(\widehat{I})$. Such a weighting function will help us upper-bound $\text{opt}(\text{LP}(\widehat{I}))$ in terms of $\text{opt}(I)$.

We will now describe a transformation that can help us convert any feasible solution of $\text{DLP}(\widehat{I})$ to a different feasible solution with a special property.

Transformation 9. Let (y, z) be a feasible solution to $\text{DLP}(\widehat{I})$. Let $s \in [t-1]$. Define $y_t := 0$ and $h_{t+1} := 0$. Then change y_s to $\max(y_s, y_{s+1} + (h_{s+1} - h_{s+2})z)$.

Lemma 25. Let (y, z) be a feasible solution to $\text{DLP}(\widehat{I})$. Let (\widehat{y}, z) be the new solution obtained by applying Transformation 9 with parameter $s \in [t-1]$. Then (\widehat{y}, z) is feasible for $\text{DLP}(\widehat{I})$.

Proof. For a configuration C , let $f(C, y, z) := C^T y + (1 - h_C)z$, where $C^T y := \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} C_j y_j$. Since (y, z) is feasible for $\text{DLP}(\widehat{I})$, $f(C, y, z) \leq 1$. As per Transformation 9,

$$\widehat{y}_j := \begin{cases} \max(y_s, y_{s+1} + (h_{s+1} - h_{s+2})z) & j = s \\ y_j & j \neq s \end{cases}$$

If $y_s \geq y_{s+1} + (h_{s+1} - h_{s+2})z$, then $\widehat{y} = y$, so (\widehat{y}, z) would be feasible for $\text{DLP}(\widehat{I})$. So now assume that $y_s < y_{s+1} + (h_{s+1} - h_{s+2})z$.

Let C be a configuration. Define $C_t := 0$. Let

$$\widehat{C}_j := \begin{cases} 0 & j = s \\ C_s + C_{s+1} & j = s+1 \\ C_j & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then, $C^T \widehat{y} - \widehat{C}^T y = C_s \widehat{y}_s + C_{s+1} \widehat{y}_{s+1} - \widehat{C}_s y_s - \widehat{C}_{s+1} y_{s+1} = C_s (h_{s+1} - h_{s+2})z$.

Also, $h_{\widehat{C}} - h_C = \widehat{C}_s h_{s+1} + \widehat{C}_{s+1} h_{s+2} - C_s h_{s+1} - C_{s+1} h_{s+2} = -C_s (h_{s+1} - h_{s+2})z$.

Since $h_{\widehat{C}} \leq h_C \leq 1$, \widehat{C} is a configuration.

$$\begin{aligned} f(C, \widehat{y}, z) &= C^T \widehat{y} + (1 - h_C)z \\ &= (\widehat{C}^T y + C_s (h_{s+1} - h_{s+2})z) + (1 - h_{\widehat{C}} - C_s (h_{s+1} - h_{s+2})z)z \\ &= f(\widehat{C}, y, z) \leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (\widehat{y}, z) is feasible for $\text{DLP}(\widehat{I})$. □

Definition 10. Let (y, z) be a feasible solution to $\text{DLP}(\widehat{I})$. Let

$$\widehat{y}_j := \begin{cases} \max(y_{t-1}, z h_t) & j = t-1 \\ \max(y_j, \widehat{y}_{j+1} + (h_{j+1} - h_{j+2})z) & j < t-1 \end{cases}$$

Then (\widehat{y}, z) is called the *monotonization* of (y, z) .

Lemma 26. Let (y, z) be a feasible solution to $\text{DLP}(\widehat{I})$. Let (\widehat{y}, z) be the *monotonization* of (y, z) . Then (\widehat{y}, z) is a feasible solution to $\text{DLP}(\widehat{I})$.

Proof. (\widehat{y}, z) can be obtained by multiple applications of Transformation 9: first with $s = t-1$, then with $s = t-2$, and so on till $s = 1$. Then by Lemma 25, (\widehat{y}, z) is feasible for $\text{DLP}(\widehat{I})$. □

Let (y^*, z^*) be an optimal solution to $\text{DLP}(\widehat{I})$. Let (\widehat{y}, z^*) be the *monotonization* of (y^*, z^*) . Then define the function $\eta : [0, 1] \mapsto [0, 1]$ as

$$\eta(x) := \begin{cases} \widehat{y}_1 & \text{if } x \in [h_2, 1] \\ \widehat{y}_j & \text{if } x \in [h_{j+1}, h_j), \text{ for } 2 \leq j \leq t-1 \\ x z^* & \text{if } x < h_t \end{cases}$$

Lemma 27. η is a monotonic weighting function.

Proof. η is monotonic by the definition of monotonization.

Let $X \subseteq (0, 1]$ be a finite set such that $\text{sum}(X) \leq 1$. Let $X_0 := X \cap [0, h_t)$, let $X_1 := X \cap [h_2, 1]$ and for $2 \leq j \leq t-1$, let $X_j := X \cap [h_{j+1}, h_j]$. Let $C \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{t-1}$ such that $C_j := |X_j|$. Let $h_C := \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} C_j h_{j+1}$.

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \geq \text{sum}(X) &= \text{sum}(X_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \text{sum}(X_j) \\ &\geq \text{sum}(X_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} C_j h_{j+1} \quad (\text{for } j \geq 1, \text{ each element in } X_j \text{ is at least } h_{j+1}) \\ &= \text{sum}(X_0) + h_C \end{aligned}$$

Since $h_C \leq 1 - \text{sum}(X_0) \leq 1$, C is a configuration. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in X} \eta(x) &= \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \sum_{x \in X_j} \eta(x) = z^* \text{sum}(X_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} C_j \hat{y}_j \quad (\text{by definition of } \eta) \\ &\leq (1 - h_C) z^* + C^T \hat{y} \quad (h_C \leq 1 - \text{sum}(X_0)) \\ &\leq 1 \quad (C \text{ is a configuration and } (\hat{y}, z^*) \text{ is feasible for DLP}(\hat{I}) \text{ by Lemma 26}) \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 28. For $i \in I$, let $p(i) := \eta(h(i))w(i)$. Then $\text{opt}(\text{LP}(\hat{I})) \leq p(I) \leq T_k^{d-1} \text{opt}_{d\text{BP}}(I)$.

Proof. Let (y^*, z^*) be an optimal solution to $\text{DLP}(\hat{I})$. Let (\hat{y}, z^*) be the monotonization of (y^*, z^*) .

Suppose a rectangular item i (or a slice thereof) lies in shelf S where $S \in J_j$. Then $h(i) \in [h_{j+1}, h_j]$, where $h_{t+1} := 0$. This is because shelves in $J := \text{can-shelv}(\hat{I})$ are tight. If $j = 1$, then $\eta(h(i)) = \hat{y}_1 \geq y_1^*$. If $2 \leq j \leq t-1$, then $\eta(h(i)) \in \{\hat{y}_{j-1}, \hat{y}_j\} \geq \hat{y}_j \geq y_j^*$. We are guaranteed that for $j \in [t-1]$, and each shelf $S \in J_j$, $w(S) = 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} p(I) &= \sum_{j=1}^t \sum_{S \in J_j} \sum_{i \in S} \eta(h(i))w(i) + \sum_{i \in \hat{I}_S} \eta(h(i))w(i) \quad (\text{by definition of } p) \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \sum_{S \in J_j} \sum_{i \in S} y_j^* w(i) + \sum_{i \in \hat{I}_S} (h(i)z^*)w(i) \quad (\text{by definition of } \eta) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} y_j^* q + a(\hat{I}_S)z^* \quad (\text{since } w(J_j) = q \text{ for } j \in [t-1]) \\ &= \text{opt}(\text{DLP}(\hat{I})) \quad ((y^*, z^*) \text{ is optimal for DLP}(\hat{I})) \end{aligned}$$

By strong duality of linear programs, $\text{opt}(\text{LP}(\hat{I})) = \text{opt}(\text{DLP}(\hat{I})) \leq p(I)$.

Since η and H_k are weighting functions (by Lemma 27), we get that $p(I) \leq T_k^{d-1} \text{opt}_{d\text{BP}}(I)$ by Theorem 1. □

Theorem 6 (Structural theorem). Let I be a set of dD items. Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be a constant. Then $\text{sopt}_\delta(\text{wround}(I)) < T_k^{d-1}(1 + \delta) \text{opt}_{d\text{BP}}(I) + \lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil + 1 + \delta$.

Proof. By Corollary 1.2, we get $a(\widehat{I}_L) \leq a(\widehat{I}) = \text{vol}(\widetilde{f}_k(I)) \leq T_k^{d-1} \text{opt}_{d\text{SP}}(I) \leq T_k^{d-1} \text{opt}_{d\text{BP}}(I)$. By Lemma 23, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sopt}_\delta(\widehat{I}) &< \text{opt}(J^{(\text{lo})} \cup \widehat{I}_S) + \delta a(\widehat{I}_L) + (1 + \delta) && \text{(by Lemma 23)} \\ &\leq \text{opt}(\text{LP}(\widehat{I})) + \left\lceil \frac{1}{\delta^2} \right\rceil + \delta T_k^{d-1} \text{opt}_{d\text{BP}}(I) + (1 + \delta) && \text{(by Lemmas 20 and 24)} \\ &\leq T_k^{d-1} (1 + \delta) \text{opt}_{d\text{BP}}(I) + \left\lceil \frac{1}{\delta^2} \right\rceil + 1 + \delta && \text{(by Lemma 28)} \end{aligned}$$

□

A.3 Guessing Shelves and Bins

We want `guess-shelves`($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, \delta$) to return all possible packings of empty shelves into at most $n := |\widehat{\mathcal{I}}|$ bins such that each packing is structured for $(\text{flat}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}), \delta)$.

Let $H = \{h(i) : i \in \text{flat}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}})\}$. Let $N := |\text{flat}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}})|$. `guess-shelves`($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, \delta$) starts by picking the distinct heights of shelves by iterating over all subsets of H of size at most $\lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil$. The number of such subsets is at most $N^{\lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil} + 1$. Let $\widetilde{H} := \{h_1, h_2, \dots, h_t\}$ be one such guess, where $t \leq \lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil$. Without loss of generality, assume $h_1 > h_2 > \dots > h_t > \delta$.

Next, `guess-shelves` needs to decide the number of shelves of each height and a packing of those shelves into bins. Let $C \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^t$ such that $h_C := \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} C_j h_j \leq 1$. Then C is called a configuration. C represents a set of shelves that can be packed into a bin and where C_j shelves have height h_j . Let \mathcal{C} be the set of all configurations. We can pack at most $\lceil 1/\delta \rceil - 1$ items into a bin because $h_t > \delta$. By Lemma 19, we get

$$|\mathcal{C}| \leq \binom{\lceil 1/\delta \rceil - 1 + t}{t} \leq \binom{\lceil 1/\delta \rceil - 1 + \lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil}{\lceil 1/\delta \rceil - 1} \leq \left(\left\lceil \frac{1}{\delta^2} \right\rceil + 1 \right)^{1/\delta}.$$

There can be at most n bins, and `guess-shelves` has to decide the configuration of each bin. By Lemma 19, the number of ways of doing this is at most $\binom{|\mathcal{C}|+n}{|\mathcal{C}|} \leq (n+1)^{|\mathcal{C}|}$. Therefore, `guess-shelves` computes all configurations and then iterates over all $\binom{|\mathcal{C}|+n}{|\mathcal{C}|}$ combinations of these configs.

This completes the description of `guess-shelves` and proves Theorem 7.

A.4 choose-and-pack

We will define a new problem, called the multiple-choice fractional shelf min-knapsack (MCF-SMKS). We will design a pseudo-polynomial-time algorithm for it, and use that as a subroutine in `choose-and-pack`.

A.4.1 MCFSMKS

Definition 11. *In the multiple-choice fractional shelf min-knapsack (MCFSMKS), we are given a pair (\mathcal{I}, J) as input. Here \mathcal{I} is a set of 2D itemsets, and J is a set of m rectangles (called boxes). Each itemset $I \in \mathcal{I}$ has a cost $c(I)$ associated with it. $c(I)$ can be ∞ . Each item $i \in \text{flat}(\mathcal{I})$ has height $h(i)$ and width $w(i)$. The j^{th} box in J has height h_j and width w_j . Without loss of generality assume that $h_1 > h_2 > \dots > h_m$ and the height of every item is at most h_1 .*

Our task is to pick a subset $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, and then pack an assortment $K \in \Psi(\mathcal{K})$ into the boxes where items can be sliced using vertical cuts and such that the bottom edge of each item or slice touches the bottom edge of some box. K is called a feasible solution to the MCFSMKS instance (\mathcal{I}, J) . The cost of this solution is given by $\sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}-\mathcal{K}} c(I)$. We have to minimize the cost.

Assume that in a MCFSMKS instance (\mathcal{I}, J) , the width of every item and box is an integer. Arbitrarily order the itemsets in \mathcal{I} . Let $\mathcal{I} = [I_1, I_2, \dots, I_{|\mathcal{I}|}]$. Let $n \in \{0, 1, \dots, |\mathcal{I}|\}$ and $\vec{u} = [u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m]$ be a vector where $u_j \in \{0, 1, \dots, w_j\}$. Define $g(n, \vec{u})$ as the minimum cost for the instance (\mathcal{I}', J') , where \mathcal{I}' contains the first n itemsets from \mathcal{I} , and J' is a set of m boxes where the j^{th} box has height h_j and width u_j .

We can get a recurrence relation for g :

$$g(n, \vec{u}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n = 0 \\ \infty & \text{if } u_j < 0 \text{ for some } j \in [m] \\ \min \left(\begin{array}{l} c(I_n) + g(n-1, \vec{u}), \\ \min_{i \in I_n} g(n-1, \text{reduce}(\vec{u}, i)) \end{array} \right) & \text{if } n > 0 \text{ and } \forall j, u_j \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Here $\text{reduce}(\vec{u}, i)$ is the vector obtained as follows: Initialize x to $w(i)$. Let p_i be the largest integer j such that $h(i) \leq h_j$. For j varying from p_i to 2: subtract $\min(x, u_j)$ from u_j and x , and then subtract x from u_1 . The new value of \vec{u} is defined to be the output of $\text{reduce}(\vec{u}, i)$. $\text{reduce}(\vec{u}, i)$ represents the action of greedily slicing and placing item i in the box with the smallest height that can accommodate item i .

There are $W := \prod_{j=1}^m (w_j + 1)$ possible values of \vec{u} . For each value of \vec{u} , we can compute $g(n, \vec{u})$ in $O(|I_n| + m)$ time, provided that $g(n-1, \vec{v})$ is already computed for all \vec{v} . Therefore, we can easily compute $g(n, \vec{u})$ for all n and \vec{u} in $O(|\text{flat}(\mathcal{I})|W)$ time using dynamic programming. Then $g(|\mathcal{I}|, \vec{w})$ gives us the minimum cost attainable for the instance (\mathcal{I}, J) , where $\vec{w} := [w_1, w_2, \dots, w_m]$. With a bit more work, we can also decide which items to pack to minimize the cost. See Algorithm 6.

Algorithm 6 `mcfsmks-pack`(\mathcal{I}, J): Optimally solves the MCFSMKS problem when item widths and box widths are integers. Returns a pair (K, C) , where K is the set of items to pack and C is the cost of the solution. \mathcal{I} is a set of 2D itemsets. J is a set of m boxes.

```

1: Compute  $g(n, \vec{u})$  for all  $n$  and  $\vec{u}$  using Eq. (2) and dynamic programming.
2: if  $g(|\mathcal{I}|, \vec{w})$  is  $\infty$  then
3:   return  $(\{\}, \infty)$ 
4: end if
5: Initialize  $\vec{u}$  to  $\vec{w}$ .
6: Initialize  $C$  to 0.
7: Initialize  $K$  to the empty set.
8: for  $n$  from  $|\mathcal{I}|$  to 1 do
9:   if  $g(n, \vec{u}) == g(n-1, \text{reduce}(\vec{u}, i))$  for some  $i \in I_n$  then
10:    Add  $i$  to  $K$ .
11:   else // Now  $g(n, \vec{u}) = c(I_n) + g(n-1, \vec{u})$ 
12:      $C += c(I_n)$ 
13:   end if
14: end for
15: return  $(K, C)$ 

```

A.4.2 choose-and-pack Using MCFSMKS

choose-and-pack($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P, \delta$) takes as input a set $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ of 2D itemsets, a constant $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and a packing P of empty shelves into bins that is structured for $(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, \delta)$. **choose-and-pack**($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P, \delta$) will try to find an assortment \overline{K} of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ such that it can pack δ -large items from \overline{K} into the shelves in P plus one additional shelf, and at the same time minimize the area of δ -small items from \overline{K} .

Let the heights of the shelves in P be $h_1 > h_2 > \dots > h_t > \delta$, where $t \leq \lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil$. Let there be n_j shelves of height h_j .

Firstly, if two items in an itemset are both δ -small, then it is sub-optimal to pack the one with larger area. Therefore, from each itemset, we only need to retain one δ -small item of minimum area and discard the rest. Also, we can discard all items of height more than h_1 since they cannot be packed into any shelf.

We will now transform $(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P)$ into an MCFSMKS instance. For each δ -large item $i \in \text{flat}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}})$, let $\tau(i)$ be an item of height $h(i)$ and width $\lceil nw(i) \rceil$. Intuitively, $\tau(i)$ rounds i 's width to a multiple of $1/n$ and then scales it by a factor of n . Here rounding enables us to limit the number of distinct widths of items. For an itemset $\widehat{I} \in \widehat{\mathcal{I}}$, let $\tau(\widehat{I}) := \{\tau(i) : i \in \widehat{I} \text{ and } h(i) > \delta\}$. Define the cost $c(\tau(\widehat{I}))$ as the area of the δ -small item in \widehat{I} , and let $c(\tau(\widehat{I}))$ be ∞ when there is no δ -small item in \widehat{I} . Define $\tau(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}) := \{\tau(\widehat{I}) : \widehat{I} \in \widehat{\mathcal{I}}\}$. Let $\tau(P)$ be a set of t boxes, where the j^{th} box has height h_j and width $w_j := n_j n$ if $j \neq 1$ and width $w_1 := (n_1 + 1)n$ if $j = 1$. Then $(\tau(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}), \tau(P))$ is an MCFSMKS instance where the widths of items and boxes are integers.

Lemma 29. *Let $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ be a set of 2D itemsets and P be a packing of empty shelves into bins that is structured for $(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, \delta)$. Let \widehat{K} be an assortment of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $\widehat{K}_L := \{i \in \widehat{K} : h(i) > \delta\}$ can be packed into the shelves in P . Then $\tau(\widehat{K}_L)$ is a feasible solution to the MCFSMKS instance $(\tau(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}), \tau(P))$ of cost $a(\widehat{K} - \widehat{K}_L)$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{K} be the itemsets containing \widehat{K}_L . Then the cost of $\tau(\widehat{K}_L)$ is $\sum_{I \in \widehat{\mathcal{I}} - \mathcal{K}} c(\tau(I)) = a(\widehat{K} - \widehat{K}_L)$.

Suppose we round up the width of each item in \widehat{K}_L to the nearest multiple of $1/n$. So the new width of item $i \in \widehat{K}_L$ is $\lceil nw(i) \rceil / n$. The size of each item will increase by at most $1/n$. Slice out this newly-grown part of each item, and pack them into a new shelf of height h_1 . This is possible since the total width of these slices is at most 1.

Now for each $j \in [t]$, concatenate all the shelves of height h_j into one large box of height h_j . Then scale the width of each item and each box by a factor n . This gives us a feasible packing of $\tau(\widehat{K}_L)$ into $\tau(P)$. \square

Lemma 29 shows how an assortment of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ packable into P can be transformed into a feasible solution of the MCFSMKS instance $(\tau(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}), \tau(P))$. We will now try to do the opposite, i.e., using a feasible solution of $(\tau(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}), \tau(P))$ to get an assortment of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ that can be packed into P .

Let K be a feasible solution to the MCFSMKS instance $(\tau(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}), \tau(P))$ of finite cost (note that for all $i \in K$, $h(i) > \delta$). Let \overline{K}_L be the items in $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ corresponding to K , i.e., $\tau(\overline{K}_L) = K$. Let \mathcal{K} be the itemsets that K_L belong to. Let \overline{K}_S be the δ -small items in $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} - \mathcal{K}$. Then define $\tau^{-1}(K)$ as $\overline{K}_L \cup \overline{K}_S$. Note that there must be one δ -small item in each itemset in $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} - \mathcal{K}$ because the cost is finite. Therefore, $\tau^{-1}(K)$ is an assortment of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$.

Lemma 30. *Let K be a feasible solution to the MCFSMKS instance $(\tau(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}), \tau(P))$ of cost C . Let $\overline{K} = \tau^{-1}(K)$ and $\overline{K}_L := \{i \in \overline{K} : h(i) > \delta\}$. Then \overline{K}_L can be packed into the shelves in P plus one additional shelf, and $a(\overline{K} - \overline{K}_L) = C$.*

Proof. $a(\overline{K} - \overline{K}_L) = C$ by definition of cost and τ^{-1} .

Let $K_j \subseteq K$ be the items (or slices) packed in the j^{th} box. Therefore, $w(K_j) \leq w_j$ and $h(i) \leq h_j$ for each $i \in K_j$. Let \overline{K}_j be the corresponding items in \overline{K}_L , i.e., $\tau(\overline{K}_j) = K_j$.

$$w(\overline{K}_j) = \sum_{i \in \overline{K}_j} w(i) \leq \sum_{i \in \overline{K}_j} \frac{w(\tau(i))}{n} = \frac{w(K_j)}{n} \leq \frac{w_j}{n}$$

For $j > 1$, we have $w_j = n_j n$, so $w(\overline{K}_j) \leq n_j$. Therefore, \overline{K}_j fits into shelves of height h_j in P . For $j = 1$, we have $w_j = (n_1 + 1)n$, so $w(\overline{K}_1) \leq n_1 + 1$. Therefore, \overline{K}_1 fits into shelves of height h_1 in P plus one additional shelf of height h_1 . \square

We can now describe **choose-and-pack** (Algorithm 7).

Algorithm 7 **choose-and-pack**($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P, \delta$): takes as input a set $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ of 2D itemsets, a constant $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and a packing P of empty shelves into bins that is structured for $(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, \delta)$. It either returns **null** or returns a packing of an assortment of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$.

```

1: for  $I \in \widehat{\mathcal{I}}$  do
2:   Retain just one  $\delta$ -small item in  $I$  of minimum area and discard the rest.
3:   Discard all items in  $I$  of height more than  $h_1$ .
4: end for
5:  $(K, C) = \text{mcfsmks-pack}(\tau(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}), \tau(P))$ .
6: if  $C$  is  $\infty$  then
7:   return null
8: end if
9: Let  $\overline{K} := \tau^{-1}(K)$ . Let  $\overline{K}_L := \{i \in \overline{K} : h(i) > \delta\}$ .
10: Create a shelf  $S$  of height  $h_1$ . Greedily pack  $\overline{K}_L$  into  $P \cup \{S\}$ . (This can be done by
    computing can-shelv( $\overline{K}_L$ ) and by Lemma 18.)
11: Pack  $S$  into a new bin. Let  $\overline{P}$  be the resulting bin-packing of  $\overline{K}_L$ .
12: if unshelved area in  $\overline{P}$  is less than  $a(\overline{K} - \overline{K}_L)$  then
13:   return null
14: else
15:   Pack  $\overline{K} - \overline{K}_L$  into the unshelved area in  $\overline{P}$ .
16:   return  $\overline{P}$ 
17: end if

```

Theorem 8. *If the output \overline{P} of **choose-and-pack**($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P, \delta$) is not **null**, then \overline{P} is a shelf-based δ -fractional packing of some assortment \overline{K} of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $|\overline{P}| \leq |P| + 1$ and the distinct shelf heights in \overline{P} are the same as that in P .*

Proof. \overline{K} is an assortment of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$. Let $\overline{K}_L := \{i \in \overline{K} : h(i) > \delta\}$. By Lemma 30, \overline{K}_L can be packed into the shelves in P plus one additional shelf S . Therefore, **choose-and-pack** can successfully execute line 10.

The set of shelves in \overline{P} is the same as that in P except that \overline{P} has an extra shelf of height S . The set of bins is also the same, except that S is packed into a new bin. \square

Theorem 9. *Let \widehat{K} be any assortment of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ and let P be any structured δ -fractional bin-packing of \widehat{K} . Then the output of **choose-and-pack**($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P, \delta$) is not **null**.*

Proof. Let $\widehat{K}_L := \{i \in \widehat{K} : h(i) > \delta\}$. By Lemma 29, $\tau(\widehat{K}_L)$ is feasible for $(\tau(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}), \tau(P))$ and has cost $a(\widehat{K} - \widehat{K}_L)$. Since K is the optimal solution to $(\tau(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}), \tau(P))$ and has cost C , we get $a(\widehat{K} - \widehat{K}_L) \geq C$. Hence, C is finite and **choose-and-pack** doesn't return **null** at line 7.

\overline{K} is an assortment of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$. By Lemma 30, $a(\overline{K} - \overline{K}_L) = C < a(\widehat{K} - \widehat{K}_L)$. Since $\widehat{K} - \widehat{K}_L$ fits into the unshelved area, we can also pack $\overline{K} - \overline{K}_L$ into the unshelved area. Therefore, `choose-and-pack` doesn't return `null` at line 13.

Hence, the output of `choose-and-pack`($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P, \delta$) is not `null`. \square

Theorem 10. `choose-and-pack`($\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P, \delta$) runs in time $O(Nn^{2\lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil})$, where $N := |\text{flat}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}})|$ and $n := |\widehat{\mathcal{I}}|$.

Proof. Time taken by `mcfsmks-pack`($\tau(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}), \tau(P)$) is $O(W|\text{flat}(\tau(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}))|)$, where $W := \prod_{j=1}^t (w_j + 1)$. Here $w_j := nn_j$ when $j > 1$ and $w_1 := n(n_1 + 1)$.

$|\text{flat}(\tau(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}))| \leq |\text{flat}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}})| = N$. $W \in O(n^{2t}) \subseteq O(n^{2\lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil})$.

Operations in `choose-and-pack` other than `mcfsmks-pack` take $O(N)$ time. \square

A.5 inflate

Let I be a set of dD items. Let P be a shelf-based δ -fractional bin-packing of $\widehat{I} := \text{wround}(I)$ into m bins. Let there be t distinct heights of shelves in P : $h_1 > h_2 > \dots > h_t > \delta$. We want to design an algorithm `inflate`(P) that returns a packing of I into approximately $|P|$ bins.

Define $\widehat{I}_L := \{i \in \widehat{I} : h(i) > \delta\}$ and $\widehat{I}_S := \widehat{I} - \widehat{I}_L$. Recall that for a dD item i , `btype`(i) (called *base type*) is defined to be a $(d-1)$ -dimensional vector whose j^{th} component is `typek`($\ell_j(i)$). Let there be Q distinct base types in I (so $Q \leq k^{d-1}$).

A.5.1 Separating Base Types

We will now impose an additional constraint over P : items in each shelf must have the same `btype`. This will be helpful later, when we'll try to compute a packing of dD items I .

Separating base types of \widehat{I}_S is easy, since we can slice them in both directions. An analogy is to think of a mixture of multiple immiscible liquids of different densities settling into equilibrium.

Let there be n_j shelves of height h_j . Let \widehat{I}_j be the items packed into shelves of height h_j . Therefore, $w(\widehat{I}_j) \leq n_j$. Let $\widehat{I}_{j,q} \subseteq \widehat{I}_j$ be the items of base type $q \in [Q]$.

For each q , pack $\widehat{I}_{j,q}$ into $\lceil w(\widehat{I}_{j,q}) \rceil$ shelves of height h_j (slicing items if needed). For these newly-created shelves, define the `btype` of the shelf to be `btype` of the items in it. Now the number of shelves of height h_j is at most

$$\sum_{q=1}^Q \lceil w(\widehat{I}_{j,q}) \rceil \leq \left\lceil \sum_{q=1}^Q w(\widehat{I}_{j,q}) \right\rceil + Q \leq n_j + Q$$

n_j of these shelves can be packed into existing bins in place of the old shelves. The remaining Q shelves can be packed on the base of new bins.

Therefore, by using at most tQ new bins, we can ensure that for every shelf, all items in that shelf have the same `btype`. These new bins don't contain any items from \widehat{I}_S . Call this new bin-packing P' .

A.5.2 Forbidding Horizontal Slicing

We'll now use P' to compute a shelf-based bin-packing P'' of \widehat{I} where items in \widehat{I} can be sliced using vertical cuts only.

Let $\widehat{I}_{q,S}$ be the items in \widehat{I}_S of base type q . Pack items $\widehat{I}_{q,S}$ into shelves using a variant of NFDH where items can be split using vertical cuts only. Suppose NFDH used m_q shelves to pack $\widehat{I}_{q,S}$. For $j \in [m_q]$, let $h_{q,j}$ be the height of the j^{th} shelf. Let $H_q := \sum_{j=1}^{m_q} h_{q,j}$ and $H := \sum_{q=1}^Q H_q$. Since for $j \in [m_q - 1]$, all items in the j^{th} shelf have height at least $h_{q,j+1}$,

$$a(\widehat{I}_{q,S}) > \sum_{j=1}^{m_q-1} h_{q,j+1} \geq H_q - h_{q,1} \geq H_q - \delta.$$

Therefore, $H < a(\widehat{I}_S) + Q\delta$. Let \widehat{J}_S be the set of these newly-created shelves.

Use Next-Fit to pack \widehat{J}_S into the space used by \widehat{I}_S in P' . \widehat{I}_S uses at most m bins in P' . A height of less than δ will remain unpacked in each of those bins. The total height occupied by \widehat{I}_S in P' is $a(\widehat{I}_S)$. Therefore, Next-Fit will pack a height of more than $a(\widehat{I}_S) - \delta m$.

Some shelves in \widehat{J}_S may still be unpacked. Their total height will be less than $H - (a(\widehat{I}_S) - \delta m) < \delta(Q + m)$. We will pack these shelves into new bins using Next-Fit. The number of new bins used is at most $\lceil \delta(Q + m)/(1 - \delta) \rceil$. Call this bin-packing P'' . The number of bins in P'' is at most $m' := m + tQ + \lceil \delta(Q + m)/(1 - \delta) \rceil$.

A.5.3 Shelf-Based d D packing

We'll now show how to convert the packing P'' of \widehat{I} that uses m' bins into a packing of I that uses m' d D bins.

First, we'll repack the items into the shelves. For each $q \in [Q]$, let \widehat{J}_q be the set of shelves in P'' of type q . Let $\widehat{I}^{[q]}$ be the items packed into \widehat{J}_q . Compute $\widehat{J}_q^* := \text{can-shelv}(\widehat{I}^{[q]})$ and pack the shelves \widehat{J}_q^* into \widehat{J}_q . This is possible by Lemma 18.

This repacking gives us an ordering of shelves in \widehat{J}_q . Number the shelves from 1 onwards. All items have at most 2 slices. If an item has 2 slices, and one slice is packed into shelf number p , then the other slice is packed into shelf number $p + 1$. The slice in shelf p is called the leading slice. Every shelf has at most one leading slice.

Let S_j be the j^{th} shelf of \widehat{J}_q . Let R_j be the set of unsliced items in S_j and the item whose leading slice in S_j . Order the items in R_j arbitrarily, except that the sliced item, if any, should be last. Then $w(R_j - \text{last}(R_j)) < 1$. So, we can use $\text{HDH-unit-pack}_k^{[q]}(R_j, d - 1)$ to pack R_j into a $(d - 1)$ D bin. This $(d - 1)$ D bin gives us a d D shelf whose height is the same as that of S_j . On repeating this process for all shelves in \widehat{J}_q and for all $q \in [Q]$, we get a packing of I into shelves. Since each d D shelf corresponds to a shelf in P'' of the same height, we can pack these d D shelves into bins in the same way as P'' . This gives us a bin-packing of I into m' bins.

A.5.4 The Algorithm

Appendices A.5.1, A.5.2 and A.5.3 describe how to convert a shelf-based δ -fractional packing P of \widehat{I} having t distinct shelf heights into a shelf-based d D bin-packing of I . We call this conversion algorithm `inflate`.

It is easy to see that the time taken by `inflate` is $O(|I| \log |I|)$.

If P has m bins, then the number of bins in $\text{inflate}(P)$ is at most

$$m + tQ + \left\lceil \frac{\delta(Q + m)}{1 - \delta} \right\rceil < \frac{m}{1 - \delta} + tQ + 1 + \frac{\delta Q}{1 - \delta}$$

This proves Theorem 11.

A.6 Improving Running Time

For simplicity of presentation, we left out some opportunities for improving the running time of HGAP_k . Here we briefly describe two ways of speeding up HGAP_k which reduce its running time from

$$O(N^{1+\lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil} n^{R+2\lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil})$$

to

$$O(N^{\lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil} n^{1+\lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil} (1/\delta)^{O(1/\delta)} \log n).$$

Here $N := |\text{flat}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}})|$, $n := |\widehat{\mathcal{I}}|$, $\delta := \varepsilon/(2 + \varepsilon)$ and $R := \binom{\lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil + \lceil 1/\delta \rceil - 1}{\lceil 1/\delta \rceil - 1} \leq (1 + \lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil)^{1/\delta}$.

A.6.1 Approximate guess-shelves

In **guess-shelves**, we guess two things simultaneously: (i) the number and heights of shelves (ii) the packing of the shelves into bins.

This allows us to guess the optimal structured δ -fractional packing. But we don't need that; an approximate structured packing would do. Therefore, we only guess the number and heights of shelves. This takes $(n + 1)^{\lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil}$ guesses instead of $(n + 1)^R$, where $R := \binom{\lceil 1/\delta \rceil - 1 + \lceil 1/\delta^2 \rceil}{\lceil 1/\delta \rceil - 1}$. Then we can use Lueker and De La Vega's $O(n \log n)$ -time APTAS for 1D bin-packing [12] to pack the shelves into bins.

A.6.2 Precomputing choose-and-pack

Instead of computing $\text{choose-and-pack}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, P, \delta)$ for each $P \in \text{guess-shelves}(\widehat{\mathcal{I}}, \delta)$, we can precompute the dynamic programming table of mcfsmks-pack and use that for each call to **choose-and-pack**.

B HDH-unit-pack_k

This section gives a precise description of HDH-unit-pack_k (see Algorithm 8) and proves its correctness.

Recall that for a dD item i , $i^{(j)}$ is defined to be the jD item obtained by ignoring all dimensions of i other than the first j . For a set I of dD items, let $I^{(j)} := \{i^{(j)} : i \in I\}$.

Theorem 31 (Correctness). *For a set I of items, if $\text{vol}(f_k((I - \{\text{last}(I)\})^{(d)})) < 1$, then $\text{HDH-unit-pack}_k(I, d)$ can pack $I^{(d)}$ in a dD bin.*

Proof. Let us prove this by induction on d . Without loss of generality, assume that I is a set of dD items. Let $\mathcal{P}(d)$ be this proposition: For every sequence I of dD items, if $\text{vol}(f_k(I)) < 1 + \text{vol}(f_k(\text{last}(I)))$, then $\text{HDH-unit-pack}_k(I, d)$ can pack I into a dD bin.

Algorithm 8 HDH-unit-pack_k^[t](I, d): For any $d \geq 1$, returns a recursive-shelf-based packing of $I^{(d)}$ into a dD bin. Here I is a sequence of $d'D$ items where $d' \geq d$, and $\text{vol}(f_k((I - \{\text{last}(I)\})^{(d)})) < 1$. Here $\text{last}(I)$ is the last item in sequence I . Also, all items in $I^{(d)}$ have the same type t , i.e., $\forall i \in I, \text{type}(i^{(d)}) = t$.

```

1: if  $d == 1$  then // when items are 1D
2:   return  $I$ . // Theorem 31 proves that they fit in a bin.
3: end if
4: if  $t_d == k$  then // when length in  $d^{\text{th}}$  dimension is small
5:   Sort  $I$  in decreasing order of  $d^{\text{th}}$  dimension.
6: end if // otherwise don't disturb ordering of items.
7: Let  $P$  be an empty list.
8: while  $|I| > 0$  do
9:   Find  $J$ , the smallest prefix of  $I$  such that  $J = I$  or  $\text{vol}(f_k(J^{(d-1)})) \geq 1$ .
10:  Let  $t'$  be a  $(d-1)$ -dimensional vector obtained by removing the  $d^{\text{th}}$  entry in  $t$ .
11:   $S = \text{HDH-unit-pack}_k^{[t']}(J, d-1)$  //  $S^{(d)}$  is a  $dD$  shelf containing items  $J^{(d)}$ .
12:  Append  $S$  to the list  $P$ .
13:  Remove  $J$  from  $I$ .
14: end while
15: Return the shelf packing  $P$ . // Theorem 31 proves that the sum of heights of shelves
doesn't exceed 1, so this is a valid packing.

```

Base case: Let I be a sequence of 1D items such that $\text{vol}(f_k(I)) < 1 + \text{vol}(f_k(\text{last}(I)))$.

Suppose $t_1 \neq k$. Then for all $i \in I, \text{vol}(i) \leq 1/t_1 = \text{vol}(f_k(i))$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{vol}(f_k(I)) < 1 + \text{vol}(f_k(\text{last}(I))) \\
& \implies \frac{|I|}{t_1} < 1 + \frac{1}{t_1} \\
& \implies |I| < t_1 + 1 \implies |I| \leq t_1 \\
& \implies \text{vol}(I) \leq \frac{|I|}{t_1} \leq 1
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{vol}(I) \leq 1$, I fits in a bin.

Suppose $t_1 = k$. Then for all $i \in I, \text{vol}(f_k(i)) = \frac{k}{k-2} \text{vol}(i)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{vol}(I) &= \frac{k-2}{k} \text{vol}(f_k(I)) \\
&< \frac{k-2}{k} (1 + \text{vol}(f_k(\text{last}(I)))) \\
&= \frac{k-2}{k} + \text{vol}(\text{last}(I)) \\
&\leq \frac{k-2}{k} + \frac{1}{k} < 1
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{vol}(I) \leq 1$, I fits in a bin. Therefore, $\mathcal{P}(1)$ holds.

Inductive step:

Let $d \geq 2$ and assume $\mathcal{P}(d-1)$ holds. Let I be a sequence of dD items such that $\text{vol}(f_k(I)) < 1 + \text{vol}(f_k(\text{last}(I)))$. $\mathcal{P}(d-1)$ implies that HDH-unit-pack_k(I, d) doesn't fail at line 11. Let $s = \text{last}(I)$.

For $i \in I$, define $w(i) := \prod_{j=1}^{d-1} f_k(\ell_j(i))$ and for $X \subseteq I$, define $w(X) := \sum_{i \in X} w(i)$. Let there be p shelves in the list P . Let S_j be the j^{th} shelf that was added to P . Given the way each

prefix is chosen in line 9,

$$\forall j \leq p-1, w(S_j) \geq 1 \quad (3)$$

Define $\ell_d(S_j) := \max_{i \in S_j} \ell_d(i)$ to be the height of shelf S_j . Let H be the total height of the shelves, i.e. $H := \sum_{j=1}^p \ell_d(S_j)$. Then we need to prove that the shelves fit in the bin, i.e. $H \leq 1$.

Case 1: Suppose $t_d \neq k$.

Then $\forall i \in I, \ell_d(i) \leq 1/t_d = f_k(\ell_d(i))$. Therefore,

$$1 > \text{vol}(f_k(I-s)) = \frac{w(I-s)}{t_d} \implies w(I-s) < t_d$$

Since ordering of items is not disturbed, $s \in S_p$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} t_d > w(I-s) &= \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} w(S_j) + w(S_p-s) \geq p-1 && \text{(by (3))} \\ \implies p < t_d + 1 &\implies p \leq t_d \\ \implies H = \sum_{j=1}^p \ell_d(S_j) &\leq \frac{p}{t_d} \leq 1 && (\forall i \in I, \ell_d(i) \leq 1/t_d) \end{aligned}$$

Since $H \leq 1$, the shelves fit in a dD bin.

Case 2: Suppose $t_d = k$.

Then $\forall i \in I, f_k(\ell_d(i)) = \frac{k}{k-2} \ell_d(i)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vol}(\tilde{f}_k(I)) &= \sum_{i \in I} w(i) \ell_d(i) = \frac{k-2}{k} \sum_{i \in I} w(i) f_k(\ell_d(i)) = \frac{k-2}{k} \text{vol}(f_k(I)) \\ &< \frac{k-2}{k} (1 + \text{vol}(f_k(s))) = \frac{k-2}{k} + \text{vol}(\tilde{f}_k(s)) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Since items in I were sorted in decreasing order of ℓ_d (line 5), $\forall i \in S_j, \ell_d(i) \geq \ell_d(S_{j+1})$. Then by (3), we get that for all $j \in [p-1]$,

$$\text{vol}(\tilde{f}_k(S_j)) \geq w(S_j) \ell_d(S_{j+1}) \geq \ell_d(S_{j+1}) \quad (5)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \sum_{j=1}^p \ell_d(S_j) \leq \frac{1}{k} + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \ell_d(S_{j+1}) && \text{(since } \ell_d(S_1) \leq 1/k) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{k} + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \text{vol}(\tilde{f}_k(S_j)) && \text{(by (5))} \\ &< \frac{1}{k} + \text{vol}(\tilde{f}_k(I)) \\ &< \frac{1}{k} + \frac{k-2}{k} + w(s) \ell_d(s) && \text{(by (4))} \\ &\leq \frac{k-1}{k} + \frac{1}{k} = 1 && \text{(since } \ell_d(s) \leq 1/k \text{ and } w(s) = \text{vol}(f_k(s^{(d-1)})) \leq 1) \end{aligned}$$

Since $H \leq 1$, the shelves fit in a dD bin. Therefore, $\mathcal{P}(d)$ holds.

Therefore, by mathematical induction, $\mathcal{P}(d)$ holds for all $d \geq 1$.

□

Note that `HDH-unit-packk` has a running time of $O(n \log n)$.

Comment on Caprara’s [8] analysis of `HDHk`. Caprara [8] implicitly proves Theorem 31 in Lemma 4.1 in their paper and their proof is less detailed than ours. Their algorithm is similar to ours, except that they allow arbitrarily reordering I when $t_d \neq k$, and instead of choosing a prefix of I (line 9 in `HDH-unit-packk`), they choose a subset of I that is minimal for some properties.

C Hard Instance for Shelf-Based Packing

We will prove that no shelf-based algorithm can get an asymptotic approximation factor better than T_∞^{d-1} for d D SP or d D BP. Caprara [8] proved this for $d = 2$. To do this, for any $k \geq 3$ and $m > 0$, we will show a set of items that fit into m d D bins but their optimal shelf-based strip-packing has height more than $m(1 - \varepsilon)S_k^{d-1}$, where $S_k := \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{r_j}$. Define $S_\infty := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} S_k$. It can be proven that $T_\infty = S_\infty \approx 1.6910302$.

It’s important to note what exactly we mean by shelf-based. Here we forbid item rotation and only allow stacking shelves along the d^{th} dimension (for $d = 3$, this means that the base of each shelf is perpendicular to the z -axis, and for $d = 2$, this means that all shelves have width 1). As noted by Caprara [8] for $d = 2$, if at the beginning of the algorithm we can choose whether to use horizontal shelves (width=1) or vertical shelves (height=1), and this choice depends on the input items, then we may get an asymptotic approximation factor less than T_∞ .

For simplicity of presentation, we will only consider the $d = 3$ case. We call the first dimension x -axis, the second dimension y -axis and the third dimension z -axis. An item’s length in the d^{th} dimension is called *height*. It’s easy to extend our result to higher dimensions, and we will give a few hints on how to do so.

Let r_j be the j^{th} harmonic number. Choose an integer $k \geq 2$ and positive constant $0 < \delta \leq 1/(r_k - 1)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $1/\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}$. Define $a_0 := 0$ and for $j \in [k - 1]$, define $a_j := (1 + \delta)(1 - 1/r_{j+1})$. Therefore, $0 = a_0 < a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_{k-1} \leq 1$. Create a cube of side length a_{k-1} . We will cut this cube into pieces, and then cut those pieces into items. Therefore, the items will fit into a bin. See Fig. 2 for an example.

First cut the cube using the planes $x = a_j$ for $j \in [k - 2]$. Then cut the cube using the planes $y = a_j$ for $j \in [k - 2]$. This will give us $Q := (k - 1)^2$ pieces. For the piece between the planes $x = a_{q_1-1}$, $x = a_{q_1}$, $y = a_{q_2-1}$ and $y = a_{q_2}$, we call $\vec{q} := (q_1, q_2)$ the *base type* of that piece. (For general d , make such cuts in each of the first $d - 1$ dimensions in a d D cube to get $Q := (k - 1)^{d-1}$ pieces. The type of a piece is a $(d - 1)$ -dimensional vector.) Now arbitrarily order these pieces and number them from 1 to Q . This number is called the *height type* of the piece. For the piece having height type j , use planes perpendicular to the z -axis to cut it into items of height ε^{j-1} .

Repeat this process for $m - 1$ additional cubes. Let I be the resulting set of items. So I can fit into m bins. We call I a *hard instance for shelf-based packing*.

Theorem 32. *Let I be a hard instance for shelf-based packing, parametrized by $m > 0$, $k \geq 3$, $0 < \delta \leq 1/(r_k - 1)$, $\varepsilon > 0$. Then the height of an optimal strip-packing of I is more than $m(1 - \varepsilon)S_k^{d-1}$.*

Proof. Consider items of height type j . They all have the same base type \vec{q} . These items have length $(1 + \delta)/(r_{q_1} + 1)$ along the x -axis and length $(1 + \delta)/(r_{q_2} + 1)$ along the y -axis. For any $j \in [k - 1]$, we have $1/(r_j + 1) < (1 + \delta)/(r_j + 1) \leq 1/r_j$. Hence, we can have at most $r_{q_1}r_{q_2}$ such




Figure 2: Constructing a hard instance for $d = 3$, $k = 3$, $\varepsilon = 1/2$, and $\delta = 1/(r_k - 1) = 1/5$. The top half of the figure shows how to cut out $(k - 1)^{d-1} = 4$ pieces from a cube of side length $a_{k-1} = 1$. The bottom half shows how to cut out $1/\varepsilon^{j-1}$ items from piece number j .

items in one shelf. Let $R_j := r_{q_1} r_{q_2}$. Since there are m/ε^{j-1} items of height type j , these items will be spread across at least $m/R_j \varepsilon^{j-1}$ shelves. Those shelves will have height at least ε^{j-1} . Therefore, for all $j \in [Q]$, we have at least $m_j := m/R_j \varepsilon^{j-1}$ shelves of height at least $h_j := \varepsilon^{j-1}$. We will use this fact to lower-bound the height of the optimal shelf-based strip-packing of I .

Let x_j be the number of shelves of height exactly ε^{j-1} . Then the total height of the optimal shelf-based strip-packing of I is lower-bounded by the following linear program:

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^Q} \sum_{i=1}^Q h_i x_i \quad \text{where} \quad \sum_{j=1}^i x_j \geq m_i \quad \forall i \in [Q]$$

Define $m_0 := h_{Q+1} := 0$. Let $\hat{x}_i := m_i - m_{i-1}$. Then \hat{x} is a feasible solution to this linear program and has objective value

$$\sum_{i=1}^Q h_i \hat{x}_i = \sum_{i=1}^Q h_i (m_i - m_{i-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^Q (h_i - h_{i+1}) m_i$$

The dual of this linear program is

$$\max_{y \in \mathbb{R}^Q} \sum_{i=1}^Q y_i m_i \quad \text{where} \quad \sum_{j=i}^Q y_j \leq h_i \quad \forall i \in [Q]$$

Let $\hat{y}_i := h_i - h_{i+1}$. Then \hat{y} is a feasible solution to the dual linear program and has objective value $\sum_{i=1}^Q h_i \hat{x}_i$. By the weak duality of linear programs, \hat{x} is an optimal solution to the linear program. Therefore, the total height of the optimal shelf-based strip-packing of I is lower-

bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^Q (h_i - h_{i+1})m_i &> m \sum_{i=1}^Q (\varepsilon^{i-1} - \varepsilon^i) \frac{1}{R_i \varepsilon^{i-1}} = m(1 - \varepsilon) \sum_{i=1}^Q \frac{1}{R_i} \\
&= m(1 - \varepsilon) \sum_{q_1=1}^{k-1} \sum_{q_2=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{r_{q_1} r_{q_2}} = m(1 - \varepsilon) \left(\sum_{q=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{r_q} \right)^{d-1} \\
&= m(1 - \varepsilon) S_k^{d-1} \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

D Weighting Function Transform

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.

Lemma 33. *Let I be a set of dD items that can be packed into a bin. Let g be a weighting function. Let $q \in [d]$. For $i \in I$, define $g(i)$ to be the item \hat{i} for which $\ell_j(\hat{i}) := \ell_j(i)$ when $j \neq q$ and $\ell_q(\hat{i}) := g(\ell_q(i))$. Then the items $\{g(i) : i \in I\}$ can be packed into a dD bin (without rotating the items).*

Bansal, Caprara and Sviridenko [3] give a brief proof sketch for $d = 2$, based on which we provide a full proof below.

Proof. Any dD cuboid can be represented as the Cartesian product of d closed intervals on the real line. Let the bin be $[0, 1]^d$. Any item $i \in I$ can be written as $\prod_{j=1}^d [v_j(i), v_j(i) + \ell_j(i)]$. Here $v_j(i)$ is called the *position* of item i in dimension j . Since each item i lies completely inside the bin, $0 \leq v_j(i) < v_j(i) + \ell_j(i) \leq 1$. Two cuboids A and B are said to overlap if their intersection has positive volume. Since I is a valid packing, no two items overlap.

Assume without loss of generality that $q = d$. Let $\text{proj}(i)$ be the projection of item i onto the hyperplane perpendicular to the d^{th} dimension. This hyperplane can be thought of as the *base* of the bin.

We'll now show that for each item i , we can change $\ell_d(i)$ to $g(\ell_d(i))$ and change $v_d(i)$ so that the items continue to fit in the bin. But to define what the new value of $v_d(i)$ would be, we need to first introduce some notation.

For two items i_1 and i_2 , we say that $i_1 \prec i_2$ (i_1 is a predecessor of i_2) iff $v_d(i_1) < v_d(i_2)$ and $\text{proj}(i_1)$ overlaps $\text{proj}(i_2)$. Call a sequence $[i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{m-1}]$ of items a *chain* iff $i_{m-1} \prec i_{m-2} \prec \dots \prec i_0$. i_0 is called the head of this chain. The *augmented height* of a chain S is defined to be $\sum_{i \in S} g(\ell_d(i))$. For each item i , we wish to find the chain headed at i with the maximum augmented height.

For an item i , define

$$\text{level}(i) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \text{ has no predecessors} \\ 1 + \max_{i' \prec i} \text{level}(i') & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Since \prec is anti-symmetric, level is well-defined. Define π and u as

$$u(i) := g(\ell_d(i)) + \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \text{level}(i) = 0 \\ u(\pi(i)) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \pi(i) := \begin{cases} \text{null} & \text{if } \text{level}(i) = 0 \\ \operatorname{argmax}_{i' \prec i} u(i') & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

In the definition of π , ties can be broken arbitrarily for argmax. $i' \prec i$ implies $\text{level}(i') < \text{level}(i)$, so $\text{level}(\pi(i)) < \text{level}(i)$. This ensures that the definitions of π and u are not mutually circular.

It can be proven, by inducting on $\text{level}(i)$, that $\Pi(i) := [i, \pi(i), \pi(\pi(i)), \dots]$ is the chain headed at i with the maximum augmented height, and that the augmented height of $\Pi(i)$ is $u(i)$.

Transformation 12. For each item $i \in I$, change $\ell_d(i)$ to $g(\ell_d(i))$ and change $v_d(i)$ to $v'_d(i) := u(i) - g(\ell_d(i))$.

We need to prove that Transformation 12 produces a valid packing, i.e. items don't overlap and all items lie completely inside the bin $[0, 1]^d$.

Let i_1 and i_2 be any two items. We'll prove that they don't overlap in the new packing. If $\text{proj}(i_1)$ and $\text{proj}(i_2)$ don't overlap, then i_1 and i_2 don't overlap and we are done, so assume $\text{proj}(i_1)$ and $\text{proj}(i_2)$ overlap. Assume without loss of generality that $i_1 \prec i_2$. Then $\text{level}(i_2) \geq 1$ and

$$v'_d(i_2) = u(i_2) - g(\ell_d(i_2)) = \max_{i' \prec i_2} u(i') \geq u(i_1) = v'_d(i_1) + g(\ell_d(i_1))$$

Therefore, i_1 and i_2 don't overlap in the new packing.

After Transformation 12, item i lies completely inside the bin iff $v'_d(i) + g(\ell_d(i)) = u(i) \leq 1$. Let $i_0 := i$ and $\Pi(i) = [i_0, i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{m-1}]$. Then $u(i) = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} g(\ell_d(i_j))$ and for all $j \in [m-1]$, $i_j \prec i_{j-1}$. Since i_j and i_{j-1} don't overlap in the original packing, but $\text{proj}(i_j)$ and $\text{proj}(i_{j-1})$ overlap, we get $v_d(i_{j-1}) \geq v_d(i_j) + \ell_d(i_j)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \ell_d(i_j) &\leq \ell_d(i) + \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} (v_d(i_{j-1}) - v_d(i_j)) && \text{(since } v_d(i_{j-1}) \geq v_d(i_j) + \ell_d(i_j)) \\ &= \ell_d(i) + v_d(i) - v_d(i_{m-1}) \leq 1 && (\because \text{ in the original packing, } i \text{ lies in the bin}) \end{aligned}$$

Since g is a weighting function and $\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \ell_d(i_j) \leq 1$, we get $u(i) = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} g(\ell_d(i_j)) \leq 1$. Therefore, the packing obtained by Transformation 12 is valid. So $\{g(i) : i \in I\}$ can be packed into a bin. \square

Theorem 1. Let I be a set of dD items that can be packed into a bin. Let g_1, g_2, \dots, g_d be weighting functions. For $i \in I$, define $g(i)$ as the item whose length is $g_j(\ell_j(i))$ in the j^{th} dimension. Then $\{g(i) : i \in I\}$ can be packed into a dD bin (without rotating the items).

Proof. Apply Lemma 33 multiple times, with q ranging from 1 to d . \square

E FPTAS for 1MCKS

Let (\mathcal{I}, p) be a 1MCKS instance, i.e., \mathcal{I} is a set of 1D itemsets and for each item $i \in \text{flat}(\mathcal{I})$, $p(i)$ is the profit of item i and $s(i)$ is the size of item i . A set $J \subseteq \text{flat}(\mathcal{I})$ is said to be a feasible solution to the 1MCKS problem iff J contains at most one item from each itemset and J can fit into a bin. We want to find a feasible solution of maximum profit.

Let $n := |\mathcal{I}|$ and $N := |\text{flat}(\mathcal{I})|$. For any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, we will show how to find a feasible solution of profit more than $(1 - \varepsilon) \text{opt}_{1\text{MCKS}}(\mathcal{I}, p)$ in $O(Nn^2/\varepsilon)$ time.

Our algorithm will convert the input (\mathcal{I}, p) to another 1MCKS instance (\mathcal{I}, \hat{p}) , and return the optimal solution \hat{J} to (\mathcal{I}, \hat{p}) . We first show that \hat{J} is near-optimal for (\mathcal{I}, p) . Then we show how to compute \hat{J} using dynamic programming.

Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $p_{\max} := \max_{i \in \text{flat}(\mathcal{I})} p(i)$, $\hat{p}(i) := \lfloor p(i)/\delta \rfloor$, $J := \text{argopt}_{\text{1MCKs}}(\mathcal{I}, p)$ and $\hat{J} := \text{argopt}_{\text{1MCKs}}(\mathcal{I}, \hat{p})$.

Lemma 34. $p(\hat{J}) > p(J) - n\delta$.

Proof.

$$\hat{p}(J) = \sum_{i \in J} \left\lfloor \frac{p(i)}{\delta} \right\rfloor > \sum_{i \in J} \left(\frac{p(i)}{\delta} - 1 \right) = \frac{p(J)}{\delta} - |J| \geq \frac{p(J)}{\delta} - n$$

Since $p(i) \geq \delta \hat{p}(i)$, we get

$$p(\hat{J}) = \sum_{i \in \hat{J}} p(i) \geq \sum_{i \in \hat{J}} \delta \hat{p}(i) = \delta \hat{p}(\hat{J})$$

Given the way \hat{J} and J are chosen, $p(J) \geq p(\hat{J})$ and $\hat{p}(\hat{J}) \geq \hat{p}(J)$. This gives us

$$p(\hat{J}) \geq \delta \hat{p}(\hat{J}) \geq \delta \hat{p}(J) > \delta \left(\frac{p(J)}{\delta} - n \right) = p(J) - \delta n \quad \square$$

We choose $\delta := \varepsilon p_{\max}/n$. This gives us $p(\hat{J}) > p(J) - n\delta = p(J) - \varepsilon p_{\max}$. Since $p(J) \geq p_{\max}$, we get that $p(\hat{J}) > (1 - \varepsilon)p(J) = (1 - \varepsilon) \text{opt}_{\text{1MCKs}}(\mathcal{I}, p)$.

Now we will show how to compute an optimal solution to (\mathcal{I}, \hat{p}) using dynamic programming.

Note that the profit of each item is an integer. For each item i , $\hat{p}(i) \leq p_{\max}/\delta$. Therefore, the profit of the optimal solution is upper-bounded by np_{\max}/δ . Order the itemsets of \mathcal{I} arbitrarily; let them be I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n . For $u \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, let $\mathcal{I}_u := \{I_1, I_2, \dots, I_u\}$. For each $u \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ and each $v \in \{0, 1, \dots, np_{\max}/\delta\}$, we would like to compute $c(u, v)$, which is the minimum possible total size of a feasible solution to (\mathcal{I}_u, \hat{p}) of profit v . If it's impossible to obtain a profit of v using \mathcal{I}_u , then define $c(u, v)$ to be ∞ .

We have the following recurrence relation for $c(u, v)$:

$$c(u, v) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u = 0 \text{ and } v = 0 \\ \infty & \text{if } v < 0 \text{ or } (u = 0 \text{ and } v > 0) \\ \min \left(\begin{array}{l} c(u-1, v), \\ \min_{i \in I_u} (s(i) + c(u-1, v - \hat{p}(i))) \end{array} \right) & \text{if } u > 0 \text{ and } v \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

We can use dynamic programming to compute $c(u, v)$ for all $u \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ and for all $v \in \{0, 1, \dots, np_{\max}/\delta\}$ in $O(Nnp_{\max}/\delta)$ time. The optimal profit for (\mathcal{I}, \hat{p}) is the largest index v^* for which $c(n, v^*) \leq 1$.

Given all values of $c(u, v)$ and the optimal profit v^* , we can find the optimal solution (i.e., the set of items that have profit v^*) in $O(N)$ time with a bit more work. So for $\delta := \varepsilon p_{\max}/n$, we can find the optimal solution to (\mathcal{I}, \hat{p}) in $O(Nn^2/\varepsilon)$ time. This solution is $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximate for (\mathcal{I}, p) .