

Statistical mechanics analysis of generalized multi-dimensional knapsack problems

Yuta Nakamura,¹ Takashi Takahashi,^{1,2} and Yoshiyuki Kabashima^{1,2}

¹Department of Physics, University of Tokyo, Hongo 7-3-1, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

²The Institute for Physics of Intelligence, University of Tokyo, Hongo 7-3-1, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

E-mail: nakamura-yuta470@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Abstract. Knapsack problem (KP) is a representative combinatorial optimization problem that aims to maximize the total profit by selecting a subset of items under given constraints on the total weights. In this study, we analyze a generalized version of KP, which is termed as the generalized multidimensional knapsack problem (GMDKP). As opposed to the basic KP, GMDKP allows multiple choices per item type under multiple weight constraints. Although several efficient algorithms are known and the properties of their solutions have been examined to a significant extent for basic KPs, there is a paucity of known algorithms and studies on the solution properties of GMDKP. To gain insight into the problem, we assess the typical achievable limit of the total profit for a random ensemble of GMDKP using the replica method. We also developed a heuristic algorithm that searches for approximate solutions based on the cavity method. Extensive numerical experiments indicate that the approximation accuracy of the developed algorithm is better than that of the known algorithms with practically feasible computational costs.

1. Introduction

Combinatorial optimization is a popular topic related to numerous research fields. It is deeply connected to computer science and the theory of algorithms, and it is frequently applied to real-world problems in the field of operations research. The knapsack problem (KP) is a major combinatorial optimization problem such as the traveling salesman problem and the minimum spanning tree problem [1]. There are many variants of KP, but all of them aim to maximize the total profit by selecting a subset of items as long as they do not violate the given constraints for total weights. KP has been extensively examined for a long time because of its wide applicability. Its application includes resource allocation problems [2], cutting or packing stock problems [3], and capital budgeting problems [4, 5].

The basic and most well-known version of KP, which we refer to as 0-1 one-dimensional KP (0-1 1DKP), is defined as follows: Suppose that there are N item

types. Each item type $i, 1 \leq i \leq N$, has two characteristic quantities: profit v_i and weight w_i . 0-1 1DKP aims to find a way to select items to put in a knapsack such that the total profit is maximized under the constraint that each item type can be selected at most only once, and the total weight does not exceed the capacity of the knapsack. The problem is mathematically formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\mathbf{x}}{\text{maximize}} \quad U = \sum_{i=1}^N v_i x_i, \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \sum_{i=1}^N w_i x_i \leq C, \quad x_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad (\forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}), \end{aligned}$$

where U and $\sum_{i=1}^N w_i x_i$ denote the total profit and total weight, respectively. Variables x_i denote the number of item types i to be placed in the knapsack, and C denotes the capacity of the knapsack.

We herein address the generalized multidimensional knapsack problem (GMDKP) by extending 0-1 1DKP in the following two directions:

- (i) Introduction of multiple constraints on total weights as $\sum_{i=1}^N w_{\mu i} x_i \leq C_{\mu}$ for $\mu \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, which is termed as multi-dimensionalization [6].
- (ii) Relaxation of the maximum number up to which each item type can be chosen [6]. This implies that we allow each item type i to be selected up to x_i^{\max} times. 0-1 1DKP corresponds to the case of $x_i^{\max} = 1$.

Specifically, GMDKP is expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\mathbf{x}}{\text{maximize}} \quad U = \sum_{i=1}^N v_i x_i, \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \sum_{i=1}^N w_{\mu i} x_i \leq C_{\mu}, \quad \mu \in \{1, \dots, K\}, \\ & \quad \quad \quad x_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, x_i^{\max}\} \quad (\forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}). \end{aligned}$$

Two issues are worth discussing here. The first issue is related to the theoretically achievable limit of the total profit of the GMDKP, which offers a baseline for examining the performance of the approximate algorithms. Korutcheva et al. [7] considered a multidimensional version and analyzed the typical properties of solutions for its random ensemble while maintaining $x_i^{\max} = 1$ ($\forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$). We term this version the multidimensional knapsack problem (MDKP). Later, Inoue [8] examined MDKP by relaxing non-negative integers x_i to spherically constrained real numbers. However, no such results have been obtained for GMDKP.

The second issue concerns the algorithm for finding the solution of GMDKP. Even in the basic case, KPs are known to belong to the class of NP-hard [9]. A significant amount of effort has been made to overcome the computational hardness, which can be classified into two directions. The first direction involves searching for exact solutions.

It has been empirically shown that methods based on dynamic programming [10] and the branch-and-bound method [11] can find exact solutions very efficiently for many instances of 0-1 1DKP. However, such methods are not applicable to MDKP and GMDKP. Therefore, for the extended KPs, we should resort to the second direction, which aims to design approximate algorithms/heuristics that return good approximate solutions. Nonetheless, to the best of our knowledge, few algorithms [12, 13] have been developed, despite many applications such as project selection problems [14, 15], capital budgeting problems [16], stock cutting problems [17], and inventory allocation problems in assemble-to-order systems [18].

In view of the current situation, we analyze a random ensemble of GMDKP using the replica method to clarify the typically achievable limit of the profit. This offers a baseline for examining the performance of the approximate algorithms. Additionally, we developed a heuristic algorithm for finding approximate solutions based on the cavity method. Extensive numerical experiments show that the developed algorithm exhibits a performance close to the theoretically achievable limit and requires only a practically acceptable computational cost even when the problem size increases.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we introduce a random ensemble of GMDKP, which is analyzed. In Section 3, we theoretically examine the typically achievable limit of the total profit for the introduced problem ensemble. In Section 4, we develop a heuristic algorithm. Then, we compare the performance of the developed algorithm with the theoretical prediction in Section 5. Furthermore, a comparison with existing algorithms is presented. The final section is devoted to discussion and future prospects.

2. Problem setup

To examine the typical properties of GMDKP, we consider an ensemble that is characterized by the following simplified conditions:

- Fix x_i^{\max} to a constant x^{\max} for $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$.
- $v_i \equiv 1$ for $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$.
- $C_\mu \equiv CN$ for $\forall \mu \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, where $C > 0$ is a proportional constant.
- $w_{\mu i}$ ($\forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \forall \mu \in \{1, \dots, K\}$) are independently distributed from an identical Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(w, \sigma^2)$ ($w > 0$).

3. Statistical mechanics analysis on the optimal solution

We compute the typical value of the achievable U in the limit of $N, K \rightarrow \infty$ by maintaining their ratio $K/N = \alpha \in [0, \infty)$. Hence, we first transform U and the total weights to appropriate expressions by considering their dependence on N [7]. Inserting $w_{\mu i} = w + \xi_{\mu i}$, where $\xi_{\mu i} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$, into the definitions of U and total weight yields the following.

$$U = \frac{C}{w}N + M\sqrt{N},$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N w_{\mu i}x_i = \sum_{i=1}^N (w + \xi_{\mu i}) \left(\frac{C}{w} + x_i - \frac{C}{w} \right) = CN + wM\sqrt{N} + u_{\mu}\sqrt{N},$$

where

$$M \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(x_i - \frac{C}{w} \right), \quad u_{\mu} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_{\mu i}x_i.$$

Under the assumption that M is $O(1)$, which is valid in the following analysis, these expressions indicate that the objective function U and total weights are constant in the leading order of $O(N)$ and vary based on the choices of $x_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, x^{\max}\}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, in the following order of $O(\sqrt{N})$. Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate the achievable limit of the prefactor M of the $O(\sqrt{N})$ term in U . Hence, we compute the number of possible choices of $\mathbf{x} = (x_i) \in \{0, 1, \dots, x^{\max}\}^N$ that correspond to M , which is as follows:

$$\Omega(\boldsymbol{\xi}, M) = \text{Tr}_{\mathbf{x}} \prod_{\mu=1}^K \Theta(-wM - u_{\mu}) \delta \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \left(x_i - \frac{C}{w} \right) - \sqrt{N}M \right),$$

where $\Theta(x) = 1$ ($x \geq 0$) and 0 ($x \leq 0$), and $\text{Tr}_{\mathbf{x}}$ denote the summation with respect to all possible choices of $\mathbf{x} = (x_i) \in \{0, 1, \dots, x^{\max}\}^N$.

$\Omega(\boldsymbol{\xi}, M)$ varies randomly depending on the realization of $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_{\mu i})$, and it is supposed to scale exponentially with respect to N . This implies that its typical behavior can be examined by assessing the average of its logarithm (entropy). This in turn leads to the use of the replica method. More specifically, for $n = 1, 2, \dots \in \mathbb{N}$, we compute the moment $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}[\Omega^n(\boldsymbol{\xi}, M)]$, where $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}[\dots]$ denotes the average operation with respect to $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, as a function of n and continue the obtained functional expression to $n \in \mathbb{R}$. Subsequently, we evaluate the average entropy per item type using the identity

$$S = \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}[\log \Omega(\boldsymbol{\xi}, M)] = \lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial n} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}[\Omega^n(\boldsymbol{\xi}, M)].$$

After some calculations (details are provided in Appendix A), this procedure provides the concrete expression of the average entropy under the replica symmetric (RS) assumption as follows:

$$S = \underset{Q, q, \hat{Q}, \hat{q}, \hat{M}}{\text{extr}} \left\{ \alpha \int Dz \log H(f(z)) + \int Dz \log \sum_{x \in \{0, 1, \dots, x^{\max}\}} g(x, z) + \frac{1}{2} \hat{Q}Q + \frac{1}{2} \hat{q}q - \frac{C}{w} \hat{M} \right\}, \quad (1)$$




Figure 1. S versus M for several values of α . Parameters are set as $w = 0.5$, $C = 0.25$, and $\sigma^2 = 1/12$.

where $\text{extr}_X\{\dots\}$ denotes the operation of the extremization of \dots with respect to X , and

$$\begin{aligned}
 Dz &= \frac{dz e^{-\frac{z^2}{2}}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}, \\
 H(x) &= \int_x^{+\infty} Dz, \\
 f(z) &= \frac{wM/\sigma + \sqrt{q}z}{\sqrt{Q-q}}, \\
 g(x, z) &= \exp\left(-\frac{\hat{Q} + \hat{q}}{2}x^2 + (\sqrt{\hat{q}}z + \hat{M})x\right).
 \end{aligned}$$

The validity of the RS assumption will be examined via comparison with the results of the numerical experiments later.

Figure 1 shows S versus M for several values of α , which is obtained by the extremization problem of (1). Recall that α is the number of constraints scaled by N . For relatively small M , S almost sustains its maximum value. This implies that almost all choices of $\mathbf{x} = (x_i) \in \{0, 1, \dots, x^{\max}\}^N$ that correspond to sufficiently small M satisfy given K weight constraints. However, as M grows, S gradually decreases and vanishes at a certain value $M = M_{\text{opt}}$. This implies that there are no exponential number of choices of \mathbf{x} that corresponds to the value of M , which provides the achievable limit of the total profit as $U_{\text{opt}} = \frac{C}{w}N + M_{\text{opt}}\sqrt{N}$. Figure 2 shows the dependence of M_{opt} on x^{\max} . For fixed α , M_{opt} monotonically increases as x^{\max} grows but almost saturates for $x^{\max} = 10 - 100$. This indicates that even if the constraint on the maximum number of choices is completely relaxed for each item, the total profit does not improve beyond a certain limit, which is determined by K constraints on the total weights.




Figure 2. Behavior of M_{opt} for $x^{\text{max}} = 1, 2, 3, 5, 10,$ and 100 . M_{opt} almost saturates for $x^{\text{max}} \geq 10$. The parameters are set as shown in Figure 1.

4. Cavity-based approximate search algorithm

The results in the previous sections characterize the achievable limit of the total profit for typical instances of MDKP. However, they do not address the demand for finding the optimal solution that maximizes the total profit for concrete instances. In this section, we develop an algorithm that optimizes the total profit for given instances of MDKP based on the cavity method [19].

To accomplish this, we consider the uniform distribution of $\mathbf{x} = (x_i)$, $x_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, x_i^{\text{max}}\}$, $i = 1, \dots, N$ that satisfy all the weight constraints given by $D = \{w_{\mu i}, C_{\mu}\}$ ($\mu = 1, \dots, K$, $i = 1, \dots, N$) as

$$p(\mathbf{x}|D) = \frac{1}{\Xi(w)} \prod_{\mu=1}^K \Theta \left(C_{\mu} - \sum_{i=1}^N w_{\mu i} x_i \right) \quad (2)$$

and evaluate the marginal distributions $p_i(x_i|D) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \setminus x_i} p(\mathbf{x}|D)$. Then, we find item type i^* that maximizes the probability of being non-zero $p_i(x_i \neq 0|D) = \sum_{x_i \neq 0} p_i(x_i|D)$, put one item of i^* in the knapsack, and reduce $x_{i^*}^{\text{max}}$ by one as $x_{i^*}^{\text{max}} \leftarrow x_{i^*}^{\text{max}} - 1$. We also subtracted the upper bounds of weight C_{μ} as $C_{\mu} \leftarrow C_{\mu} - w_{\mu i^*}$ ($\mu = 1, \dots, K$). We repeat these procedures as long as the weight constraints are satisfied. After the final repetition, the items in the knapsack constitute an approximate solution. We refer to this procedure as ‘‘Marginal-Probability-based Greedy Strategy’’ (MPGS). The pseudo-code for the procedure is summarized in Algorithm 1.

Unfortunately, it is computationally difficult to conduct this greedy search because the computational cost for assessing the marginal distributions $p_i(x_i|D)$ from the joint distribution $p(\mathbf{x}|D)$ grows exponentially with respect to N . We employed the cavity method to resolve this problem. To perform this, we depict the joint distribution by a factor graph (figure 3) and recursively update messages defined on the edges between




Figure 3. Factor graph representation of (2). The messages are passed through the edges in both directions.

Algorithm 1 MPGS

Input: $D = \{w_{\mu i}, C_{\mu}\}, x_i^{\max}$ ($i = 1, \dots, N, \mu = 1, \dots, K$)

Output: x_i ($i = 1, \dots, N$)

$x_i := 0$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$)

$i^* := 0$

while $C_{\mu} \geq 0, \forall \mu$ and $x_i^{\max} > 0, \exists i$ **do**

 evaluate $p_i(x_i|D)$ ($i = 1, \dots, N, x_i = 0, \dots, x_i^{\max}$) with **Algorithm 2** or **3**

$i^* \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_i p_i(x_i \neq 0|D)$

$x_{i^*}^{\max} \leftarrow x_{i^*}^{\max} - 1$

for $\mu = 1$ to K **do**

$C_{\mu} \leftarrow C_{\mu} - w_{\mu i^*}$

the factor and variable nodes as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mu \rightarrow i}(x_i) = c_{\mu \rightarrow i} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \setminus x_i} \Theta \left(C_{\mu} - w_{\mu i} x_i - \sum_{j \neq i} w_{\mu j} x_j \right) \prod_{j \neq i} \mathcal{M}_{j \rightarrow \mu}(x_j), \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{i \rightarrow \mu}(x_i) = c_{i \rightarrow \mu} \prod_{\nu \neq \mu} \mathcal{M}_{\nu \rightarrow i}(x_i), \quad (4)$$

by following the recipe of belief propagation (BP), which provides efficient algorithms for finding the solution of the cavity method [19]. After determining the messages, the marginal distribution is approximately assessed as follows:

$$p_i(x_i|D) \simeq c_i \prod_{\mu=1}^K \mathcal{M}_{\mu \rightarrow i}(x_i).$$

where $c_{\mu \rightarrow i}$, $c_{i \rightarrow \mu}$, and c_i are normalization constants.

The exact performance of the BP algorithm is still computationally infeasible as the computational cost for evaluating (3) grows exponentially with respect to N . This problem is solved by the Gaussian approximation employed in the approximate message passing (AMP) technique [20, 21]. More precisely, utilizing the central limit theorem, we consider $\sum_{j \neq i} w_{\mu j} x_j$ in (3) as a Gaussian random variable, which is characterized by mean $\Delta_{\mu \rightarrow i} = \sum_{j \neq i} w_{\mu j} m_{j \rightarrow \mu}$ and variance $V_{\mu \rightarrow i} = \sum_{j \neq i} w_{\mu j}^2 \chi_{j \rightarrow \mu}$, where $m_{j \rightarrow \mu}$ and

$\chi_{j \rightarrow \mu}$ denote mean and variance of $\mathcal{M}_{j \rightarrow \mu}(x_j)$, respectively. Hence, it is possible to analytically evaluate (3) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{\mu \rightarrow i}(x_i) &\propto \int Dz \Theta \left(C_\mu - w_{\mu i} x_i - \Delta_{\mu \rightarrow i} - \sqrt{V_{\mu \rightarrow i}} z \right) \\ &= H \left(\frac{w_{\mu i} x_i + \Delta_{\mu \rightarrow i} - C_\mu}{\sqrt{V_{\mu \rightarrow i}}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

This reduces the BP of (3) and (4) for updating equations with respect to $4NK$ variables, $m_{i \rightarrow \mu}$, $\chi_{i \rightarrow \mu}$, $\Delta_{\mu \rightarrow i}$, and $V_{\mu \rightarrow i}$, which are defined as edges in the factor graph. The BP algorithm is reduced, as described above, and it is summarized with the pseudo-code in Algorithm 2 as follows:

The computational cost can be further reduced by expressing the BP algorithm to that for variables defined for nodes, which is sometimes referred to as generalized approximate message passing (GAMP) [20, 22, 23]. GAMP provides the following update equations for node variables as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} a_i &\leftarrow \sum_{\mu=1}^K \frac{w_{\mu i}^2}{V_\mu} A_\mu, \\ m_i &\leftarrow \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \phi_i \left(a_i, \sum_{\mu=1}^K \frac{w_{\mu i}}{\sqrt{V_\mu}} B_\mu + a_i m_i + h \right) \right|_{h=0}, \\ \chi_i &\leftarrow \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial h^2} \phi_i \left(a_i, \sum_{\mu=1}^K \frac{w_{\mu i}}{\sqrt{V_\mu}} B_\mu + a_i m_i + h \right) \right|_{h=0}, \end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N$, and

$$\begin{aligned} V_\mu &\leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^N w_{\mu i}^2 \chi_i, \\ B_\mu &\leftarrow \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \ln H \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N w_{\mu i} m_i - C_\mu}{\sqrt{V_\mu}} - B_\mu + \theta \right) \right|_{\theta=0}, \\ A_\mu &\leftarrow \left. -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \ln H \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N w_{\mu i} m_i - C_\mu}{\sqrt{V_\mu}} - B_\mu + \theta \right) \right|_{\theta=0}, \end{aligned}$$

for $\mu = 1, \dots, K$. After obtaining these variables, the marginal distributions are assessed as $p_i(x_i|D) \propto \exp \left\{ -\frac{a_i}{2} x_i^2 + \left(\sum_{\mu=1}^K \frac{w_{\mu i}}{\sqrt{V_\mu}} B_\mu + a_i m_i \right) x_i \right\}$. This update rule is summarized in Algorithm 3. A detailed derivation is provided in Appendix B.

In this case, two issues are noteworthy. The first issue is with respect to the necessary cost of computation. Given that it is necessary to assess summations over $\mu = 1, \dots, K$ and $i = 1, \dots, N$ for each of $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $\mu = 1, \dots, K$, respectively, the computational cost of this algorithm is $O(NK)$ per update. Specifically, x_i^{\max} ($i = 1, \dots, N$) is assumed as $O(1)$. Furthermore, we should repeat the computation

Algorithm 2 BP

Input: $D = \{w_{\mu i}, C_{\mu}\}, x_i^{\max}$ ($i = 1, \dots, N, \mu = 1, \dots, K$)

Output: $p_i(x_i|D)$ ($i = 1, \dots, N, x_i = 0, \dots, x_i^{\max}$)

$\mathcal{M}_{i \rightarrow \mu}(x_i) := 1/x_i^{\max}$ ($i = 1, \dots, N, \mu = 1, \dots, K, x_i = 0, \dots, x_i^{\max}$)

$\mathcal{M}_{\mu \rightarrow i}(x_i) := 1/x_i^{\max}$ ($i = 1, \dots, N, \mu = 1, \dots, K, x_i = 0, \dots, x_i^{\max}$)

while messages not converged **do**

$\Delta_{\mu} := 0, V_{\mu} := 0$ ($\mu = 1, \dots, K$)

$\mathcal{M}_i(x_i) := 1$ ($i = 1, \dots, N, x_i = 0, \dots, x_i^{\max}$)

for $i = 1$ to N **do** ▷ pre-calculation

for $\mu = 1$ to K **do**

$m_{i \rightarrow \mu} := \text{mean}_{x_i}(\mathcal{M}_{i \rightarrow \mu}(x_i))$

$\chi_{i \rightarrow \mu} := \text{variance}_{x_i}(\mathcal{M}_{i \rightarrow \mu}(x_i))$

$\Delta_{\mu} \leftarrow \Delta_{\mu} + w_{\mu i} m_{i \rightarrow \mu}$

$V_{\mu} \leftarrow V_{\mu} + w_{\mu i}^2 \chi_{i \rightarrow \mu}$

for $x_i = 0$ to x_i^{\max} **do**

$\mathcal{M}_i(x_i) \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_i(x_i) \times \mathcal{M}_{\mu \rightarrow i}(x_i)$

for $i = 1$ to N **do**

for $\mu = 1$ to K **do**

$\Delta_{\mu \rightarrow i} := \Delta_{\mu} - w_{\mu i} m_{i \rightarrow \mu}$

$V_{\mu \rightarrow i} := V_{\mu} - w_{\mu i}^2 \chi_{i \rightarrow \mu}$

for $x_i = 0$ to x_i^{\max} **do**

$\mathcal{M}_{\mu \rightarrow i}(x_i) \leftarrow H\left(\frac{w_{\mu i} x_i + \Delta_{\mu \rightarrow i} - C_{\mu}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu \rightarrow i}}}\right)$

$\mathcal{M}_{i \rightarrow \mu}(x_i) \leftarrow \mathcal{M}_i(x_i) / \mathcal{M}_{\mu \rightarrow i}(x_i)$

 normalize $\mathcal{M}_{\mu \rightarrow i}(x_i), \mathcal{M}_{i \rightarrow \mu}(x_i)$

for $i = 1$ to N **do**

for $x_i = 0$ to x_i^{\max} **do**

$p_i(x_i|D) := \prod_{\mu=1}^K \mathcal{M}_{\mu \rightarrow i}(x_i)$

 normalize $p_i(x_i|D)$

until convergence with respect to each choice of one item, which implies that the cost of finding an approximate solution increases with respect to $O(NKT)$, where T denotes the number of selected items, as long as the number of iterations necessary for the convergence is $O(1)$ per choice. Although this may not be low-cost, it is still feasible in many practical situations. At the selection of the next item, starting with the convergent solution for the last choice, which is termed as “warm start,” is effective for suppressing the number of iterations. Another issue is related to the validity of the current approximate treatment. The developed algorithm yields the exact results under appropriate conditions, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, if $w_{\mu i}$ ’s are provided as independent random variables sampled from a distribution with zero mean and finite variance [24, 23].

Algorithm 3 GAMP**Input:** $D = \{w_{\mu i}, C_{\mu}\}, x_i^{\max}$ ($i = 1, \dots, N, \mu = 1, \dots, K$)**Output:** $p_i(x_i|D)$ ($i = 1, \dots, N, x_i = 0, \dots, x_i^{\max}$)**while** not converged **do****for** $i = 1$ to N **do**

$$a_i \leftarrow \sum_{\mu=1}^K \frac{w_{\mu i}^2}{V_{\mu}} A_{\mu}$$

$$m_i \leftarrow \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \phi_i \left(a_i, \sum_{\mu=1}^K \frac{w_{\mu i}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu}}} B_{\mu} + a_i m_i + h \right) \right|_{h=0}$$

$$\chi_i \leftarrow \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial h^2} \phi_i \left(a_i, \sum_{\mu=1}^K \frac{w_{\mu i}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu}}} B_{\mu} + a_i m_i + h \right) \right|_{h=0}$$

for $\mu = 1$ to K **do**

$$V_{\mu} \leftarrow \sum_{i=1}^N w_{\mu i}^2 \chi_i$$

$$B_{\mu} \leftarrow \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \ln H \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N w_{\mu i} m_i - C_{\mu}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu}}} - B_{\mu} + \theta \right) \right|_{\theta=0}$$

$$A_{\mu} \leftarrow \left. -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \ln H \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N w_{\mu i} m_i - C_{\mu}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu}}} - B_{\mu} + \theta \right) \right|_{\theta=0}$$

for $i = 1$ to N **do****for** $x_i = 0$ to x_i^{\max} **do**

$$p_i(x_i|D) := \exp \left\{ -\frac{a_i}{2} x_i^2 + \left(\sum_{\mu=1}^K \frac{w_{\mu i}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu}}} B_{\mu} + a_i m_i \right) x_i \right\}$$

normalize $p_i(x_i|D)$

Unfortunately, they are biased to positive numbers in KPs, including GMDKP, which does not guarantee the accuracy of the obtained solutions. Nevertheless, the cavity/BP framework provides another advantage in terms of technical ease for computing marginal distributions. The naive mean field method (nMFM) and Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) are representative alternatives for assessing marginals. However, nMFM cannot be directly employed for (2) because $\log p(\mathbf{x}|D)$ diverges to $-\infty$ for \mathbf{x} s that do not satisfy the weight constraints. Additionally, MCMC in systems such as (2), hardly converge as they are in frozen states at any temperature [25]. Hence, they offer a rational reason for selecting the cavity/BP framework as the basis of the approximate search algorithm. Replacing BP with expectation propagation (EP) [26, 27], which can somewhat incorporate the correlations among $w_{\mu i}$'s, can be another option. However, EP requires a higher computational cost of $O(N^3)$ per update than BP. Therefore, its employment is limited to relatively small systems.

5. Performance assessment

We examined the usefulness of the developed algorithm, ‘‘MPGS’’ by comparing it with the analytical results obtained in Section 3 and those of the three existing algorithms. The results shown below were obtained by the version that uses BP (Algorithm 2),




Figure 4. Achieved M_{opt} for the three algorithms when N is fixed to 50 for 0-1 MDKP. Symbols and error bars denote the averages and standard errors obtained from 500 experiments, respectively.




Figure 5. Achieved M_{opt} for the three algorithms when α is fixed to 1 for 0-1 MDKP. The parameters are set as shown in Figure 1.

which we hereafter refer to as MPGS-BP, to calculate the marginal distributions. However, similar performance is achieved by another version of MPGS that uses GAMP (Algorithm 3) as well. The algorithms that we used for the comparison correspond to neural networks (NN) developed by Ohlsson et al. (1993)[28], $\text{PECH}_{0.5}$ by Akay et al. (2006)[12], and OR-Tools by Google (2019)[29]. Furthermore, NN and $\text{PECH}_{0.5}$ are approximate algorithms. While NN is specialized for 0-1 MDKP, $\text{PECH}_{0.5}$ can be employed for GMDKP. However, it is designed to be low-cost in computation, thereby sacrificing the approximation accuracy. Unlike the other algorithms, OR-Tools is an exact algorithm. Although the algorithm can efficiently find the exact solutions for problems of moderate sizes, the necessary computational cost still grows exponentially with respect to N in the worst case. Therefore, its use is limited to N of several tens. Additionally, it is applicable only for 0-1 MDKP.

We compared these algorithms using sets of randomly generated problems under the setting provided in Section 2 with parameters $w = 0.5$, $C = 0.25$, and $\sigma^2 = 1/12$.




Figure 6. Computation time periods when N is fixed to 100 for 0-1 MDKP and when K is fixed to 10. Symbols and error bars denote the averages and standard errors obtained from 100 experiments, respectively.

Specifically, N and K varied depending on the purpose of each experiment. The experiments were conducted with codes developed using C++ in a PC with an Intel Quad Core i7 and 32 GB RAM.

Figure 4 compares total profits of obtained solutions by varying K for 0-1 MDKP of $N = 50$. Furthermore, OR-Tools provide the optimal solutions. They are close to the theoretical predictions based on the replica method. This supports the RS assumption, which is regarded as representing the optimal total profit achievable in the limit of $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Although the total profit of MPGS-BP is slightly lower than that of the OR tools in all cases, it is better than that of the other two algorithms, especially when $\alpha = K/N$ is high. Figure 5 shows the scaling of the performance with respect to the system size N while maintaining $\alpha = 1$. Data of OR-Tools are not shown for $N \geq 100$ because no solution is typically found in a feasible time. This figure indicates that MPGS-BP scales considerably well, whereas the performance of NN and PECH_{0.5} deteriorates as N increases. Figure 6 compares the raw computational time necessary to find a solution between MPGS-BP, NN, and OR-Tools for 0-1 MDKP by varying K and N . This indicates that the computational cost of MPGS-BP scales as $O(N^2K)$, while that of NN is $O(NK)$. This is due to the fact that the number of finally chosen items T grows proportionally to N in the current setting. However, the significant difference in the achieved performance, shown in figure 5, implies that the higher computational expense of MPGS-BP can still be considered as acceptable. Figure 7 compares the achieved M_{opt} for the GMDKP of $x^{\text{max}} = 2$. The data are plotted only for MPGS-BP and PECH_{0.5} because the other two algorithms are not employable for $x^{\text{max}} \geq 2$.

Given that PECH_{0.5} is designed to be low-cost in computation, there is a considerable difference in the required computational time between the two algorithms (Table 1). However, the plots show that MPGS-BP realizes a performance that is close to optimal for the entire range of α , similarly to the case of $x^{\text{max}} = 1$, while that of PECH_{0.5} becomes considerably worse as α increases. This indicates the utility of




Figure 7. Comparison of achieved profit between MPGS-BP and PECH_{0.5} when N is fixed to 100 for GMDKP of $x^{\max} = 2$. Symbols and error bars denote the averages and standard errors obtained from 500 experiments, respectively.

α	0.1	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0
MPGS-BP	2349	10789	24027	41445	60278
PECH _{0.5}	1.734	2.636	2.036	2.611	3.295

Table 1. Actual computation time required for solving GMDKP of $N = 100$ and $x^{\max} = 2$. The unit is milli-second, and values denote averages over 500 experiments.

MPGS-BP for GMDKP.

6. Summary

In summary, we analyzed a random ensemble of generalized multidimensional knapsack problem (GMDKP), which is a generalized version of the knapsack problem. Specifically, it is a representative NP-hard optimization problem. Using the replica method, we assessed the achievable limit of the total profit under multiple weight constraints for typical samples of the ensemble. We also developed a heuristic algorithm to find approximate solutions based on the cavity method. Extensive numerical experiments and comparison with the theoretical baseline, obtained via the replica method, showed that the developed algorithm outperforms other existing algorithms. Hence, it performs fairly close to the theoretically achievable limit with good scalability and practically acceptable computational cost.

In this study, we assumed that the weight parameters of GMDKP were independently provided from an identical distribution. However, these parameters can show some correlations with realistic problems. Hence, examining the usefulness of the developed algorithm for such cases is an important future task.

Acknowledgments

This study was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Nos. 21K21310 (TT), 17H00764 (YK), and JST CREST Grant No. JPMJCR1912 (YK).

Appendix A. Details of replica calculation

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\Omega^n(\boldsymbol{\xi}, M)] &= \int \prod_{\alpha, \beta=1}^n dq^{\alpha\beta} \left(\prod_{\alpha=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\Theta(-wM - u_\mu^\alpha)] \right)^K \text{Tr}_{\{x_i^\alpha\}} \prod_{\alpha < \beta} \delta \left(\sum_{i=1}^N x_i^\alpha x_i^\beta - Nq^{\alpha\beta} \right) \\
&\times \prod_{\alpha=1}^n \delta \left(\sum_{i=1}^N (x_i^\alpha)^2 - Nq^{\alpha\alpha} \right) \prod_{\alpha=1}^n \delta \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \left(x_i^\alpha - \frac{C}{w} \right) - \sqrt{NM} \right) \\
&= \int \prod_{\alpha, \beta=1}^n d\hat{q}^{\alpha\beta} dq^{\alpha\beta} \prod_{\alpha=1}^n d\hat{M}^\alpha \left(\prod_{\alpha=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\Theta(-wM - u_\mu^\alpha)] \right)^K \\
&\times \text{Tr}_{\{x_i^\alpha\}} \exp \left\{ \sum_{\alpha < \beta} \hat{q}^{\alpha\beta} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N x_i^\alpha x_i^\beta - Nq^{\alpha\beta} \right) \right. \\
&\left. - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \hat{q}^{\alpha\alpha} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N (x_i^\alpha)^2 - Nq^{\alpha\alpha} \right) + \sum_{\alpha=1}^n \hat{M}^\alpha \left(\left(x_i^\alpha - \frac{C}{w} \right) - \sqrt{NM} \right) \right\}, \tag{A.1}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Tr}_{\{x_i^\alpha\}}$ represents the summation with respect to all possible choices of $(x_i^\alpha) \in \{0, 1, \dots, x^{\max}\}^{nN}$. By introducing the RS assumption

$$q^{\alpha\beta} = \begin{cases} Q & (\alpha = \beta) \\ q & (\alpha \neq \beta) \end{cases}, \quad \hat{q}^{\alpha\beta} = \begin{cases} \hat{Q} & (\alpha = \beta) \\ \hat{q} & (\alpha \neq \beta) \end{cases}, \quad \hat{M}^\alpha = \hat{M} \quad (\alpha = 1, \dots, n),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(A.1) &= \int d\hat{q}dq d\hat{Q}dQ d\hat{M} \left(\int Dz H^n \left(\frac{wM/\sigma + \sqrt{q}z}{\sqrt{Q-q}} \right) \right)^K \\
&\times \exp \left\{ \frac{n}{2} N\hat{Q}Q - \frac{n(n-1)}{2} N\hat{q}q - \frac{C}{w} nN\hat{M} - n\sqrt{N}\hat{M}M \right\} \\
&\times \text{Tr}_{\{x_i^\alpha\}} \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \left(-\frac{1}{2} \hat{Q} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x_i^\alpha)^2 + \hat{q} \sum_{\alpha < \beta} x_i^\alpha x_i^\beta + \hat{M} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n x_i^\alpha \right) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last term can be computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\text{Tr}_{\{x^\alpha\}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \hat{Q} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x^\alpha)^2 + \hat{q} \sum_{\alpha < \beta} x^\alpha x^\beta + \hat{M} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n x^\alpha \right\} \right)^N \\
&= \left(\text{Tr}_{\{x^\alpha\}} \int Dz \exp \left\{ -\frac{\hat{Q} + \hat{q}}{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n (x^\alpha)^2 + \sqrt{\hat{q}} z \sum_{\alpha=1}^n x^\alpha + \hat{M} \sum_{\alpha=1}^n x^\alpha \right\} \right)^N \\
&= \left(\int Dz \left[\sum_{x \in \{0,1,\dots,x^{\max}\}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\hat{Q} + \hat{q}}{2} x^2 + (\sqrt{\hat{q}} z + \hat{M}) x \right\} \right]^n \right)^N.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial n} \frac{1}{N} \log(\mathbb{E}[\Omega^n(\boldsymbol{\xi}, M)]) &= \text{extr}_{Q,q,\hat{Q},\hat{q},\hat{M}} \left\{ \alpha \int Dz \log H \left(\frac{wM/\sigma + \sqrt{q}z}{\sqrt{Q-q}} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \hat{Q} Q + \frac{1}{2} \hat{q} q - \frac{C}{w} \hat{M} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \int Dz \log \left(\sum_{x \in \{0,1,\dots,x^{\max}\}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\hat{Q} + \hat{q}}{2} x^2 + (\sqrt{\hat{q}} z + \hat{M}) x \right\} \right) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Appendix B. Derivation of GAMP

We employ Taylor's expansion of $\ln H \left(\frac{w_{\mu i} x_i + \Delta_{\mu \rightarrow i} - C_\mu}{\sqrt{V_{\mu \rightarrow i}}} \right)$ up to the second order of $\frac{w_{\mu i} x_i}{\sqrt{V_{\mu \rightarrow i}}}$ handling $\frac{w_{\mu i} x_i}{\sqrt{V_{\mu \rightarrow i}}}$ as a small number, which leads to the following expression.

$$H \left(\frac{w_{\mu i} x_i + \Delta_{\mu \rightarrow i} - C_\mu}{\sqrt{V_{\mu \rightarrow i}}} \right) \propto \exp \left(-\frac{w_{\mu i}^2 A_{\mu \rightarrow i}}{2V_{\mu \rightarrow i}} x_i^2 + \frac{w_{\mu i} B_{\mu \rightarrow i}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu \rightarrow i}}} x_i \right),$$

where $A_{\mu \rightarrow i} = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \ln H \left(\frac{\Delta_{\mu \rightarrow i} - C_\mu}{\sqrt{V_{\mu \rightarrow i}}} + \theta \right) \Big|_{\theta=0}$ and $B_{\mu \rightarrow i} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \ln H \left(\frac{\Delta_{\mu \rightarrow i} - C_\mu}{\sqrt{V_{\mu \rightarrow i}}} + \theta \right) \Big|_{\theta=0}$.

This provides the mean and variance of $\mathcal{M}_{i \rightarrow \mu}(x_i)$ as

$$m_{i \rightarrow \mu} = \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \phi_i(a_{i \rightarrow \mu}, b_{i \rightarrow \mu} + h) \Big|_{h=0},$$

$$\chi_{i \rightarrow \mu} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial h^2} \phi_i(a_{i \rightarrow \mu}, b_{i \rightarrow \mu} + h) \Big|_{h=0},$$

and those of $p_i(x_i|D)$, m_i , and χ_i , as

$$m_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \phi_i(a_i, b_i + h) \Big|_{h=0},$$

$$\chi_i = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial h^2} \phi_i(a_i, b_i + h) \Big|_{h=0},$$

where $\phi_i(a, b) = \ln \left(\sum_{x_i=0}^{x_i^{\max}} \exp \left(-\frac{a}{2} x_i^2 + b x_i \right) \right)$, $a_{i \rightarrow \mu} = \sum_{\nu \neq \mu} \frac{w_{\nu i}^2}{V_{\nu \rightarrow i}} A_{\nu \rightarrow i}$, $b_{i \rightarrow \mu} = \sum_{\nu \neq \mu} \frac{w_{\nu i}}{\sqrt{V_{\nu \rightarrow i}}} B_{\nu \rightarrow i}$, $a_i = \sum_{\mu=1}^K \frac{w_{\mu i}^2}{V_{\mu \rightarrow i}} A_{\mu \rightarrow i}$, and $b_i = \sum_{\mu=1}^K \frac{w_{\mu i}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu \rightarrow i}}} B_{\mu \rightarrow i}$. The small size

of $\frac{w_{\mu i}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu \rightarrow i}}}$ validates handling $a_{i \rightarrow \mu} \simeq a_i$ and $\chi_{i \rightarrow \mu} \simeq \chi_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $\mu = 1, \dots, K$. This yields $V_{\mu \rightarrow i} \simeq V_{\mu} = \sum_{i=1}^N w_{\mu i}^2 \chi_i$ for $\mu = 1, \dots, K$, and $i = 1, \dots, N$. Similarly, as the difference between $\Delta_{\mu \rightarrow i}$ and $\Delta_{\mu} = \sum_{i=1}^N w_{\mu i} m_{i \rightarrow \mu}$ is relatively small, $A_{\mu \rightarrow i} \simeq A_{\mu} = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \ln H \left(\frac{\Delta_{\mu} - C_{\mu}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu}}} + \theta \right) \Big|_{\theta=0}$. Furthermore, we expand $m_{i \rightarrow \mu}$ and $m_{i \rightarrow \mu} \simeq \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \phi_i \left(a_i, b_i - \frac{w_{\mu i}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu}}} B_{\mu \rightarrow i} + h \right) \Big|_{h=0} \simeq \frac{\partial}{\partial h} \phi_i (a_i, b_i + h) \Big|_{h=0} - \frac{w_{\mu i}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu}}} B_{\mu \rightarrow i} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial h^2} \phi_i (a_i, b_i + h) \Big|_{h=0} = m_i - \frac{w_{\mu i}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu}}} B_{\mu \rightarrow i} \chi_i \simeq m_i - \frac{w_{\mu i}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu}}} B_{\mu} \chi_i$ and provide

$$\Delta_{\mu} = \sum_{i=1}^N w_{\mu i} m_{i \rightarrow \mu} \simeq \sum_{i=1}^N w_{\mu i} m_i - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{w_{\mu i}^2 \chi_i}{\sqrt{V_{\mu}}} B_{\mu} = \sum_{i=1}^N w_{\mu i} m_i - \sqrt{V_{\mu}} B_{\mu},$$

where $B_{\mu} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \ln H \left(\frac{\Delta_{\mu} - C_{\mu}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu}}} + \theta \right) \Big|_{\theta=0}$. Additionally, Taylor's expansion, $B_{\mu \rightarrow i} \simeq B_{\mu} - \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} \ln H \left(\frac{\Delta_{\mu} - C_{\mu}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu}}} + \theta \right) \Big|_{\theta=0} \right) \frac{w_{\mu i}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu}}} m_i = B_{\mu} + \frac{w_{\mu i} A_{\mu}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu}}} m_i$ yields

$$b_i = \sum_{\mu=1}^K \frac{w_{\mu i}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu}}} B_{\mu \rightarrow i} \simeq \sum_{\mu=1}^K \frac{w_{\mu i}}{\sqrt{V_{\mu}}} B_{\mu} + a_i m_i.$$

The aforementioned expressions provide the update equations for the node variables.

References

- [1] Bernhard H Korte, Jens Vygen, B Korte, and J Vygen. *Combinatorial optimization*. Springer, 2011.
- [2] Gabriel R Bitran and Arnoldo C Hax. Disaggregation and resource allocation using convex knapsack problems with bounded variables. *Management Science*, 27(4):431–441, 1981.
- [3] Harald Dyckhoff. A typology of cutting and packing problems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 44(2):145–159, 1990.
- [4] H Martin Weingartner. Capital budgeting of interrelated projects: survey and synthesis. *Management Science*, 12(7):485–516, 1966.
- [5] George L Nemhauser and Zev Ullmann. Discrete dynamic programming and capital allocation. *Management Science*, 15(9):494–505, 1969.
- [6] David Pisinger, H Kellerer, and U Pferschy. Knapsack problems. *Handbook of Combinatorial Optimization*, page 299, 2013.
- [7] E Korutcheva, M Opper, and B Lopez. Statistical mechanics of the knapsack problem. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 27(18):L645, 1994.
- [8] Jun-ichi Inoue. Statistical mechanics of the multi-constraint continuous knapsack problem. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 30(4):1047, 1997.
- [9] Sanjeev Arora and Boaz Barak. *Computational complexity: a modern approach*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [10] Richard Bellman. Dynamic programming. *Science*, 153(3731):34–37, 1966.
- [11] Peter J Kolesar. A branch and bound algorithm for the knapsack problem. *Management science*, 13(9):723–735, 1967.
- [12] Yalçın Akçay, Haijun Li, and Susan H Xu. Greedy algorithm for the general multidimensional knapsack problem. *Annals of Operations Research*, 150(1):17–29, 2007.

- [13] Vijay P Ramalingam. *Xqx Based Modeling For General Integer Programming Problems*. PhD thesis, University of Mississippi, 2014.
- [14] Wei Shih. A branch and bound method for the multiconstraint zero-one knapsack problem. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 30(4):369–378, 1979.
- [15] Anton J Kleywegt and Jason D Papastavrou. The dynamic and stochastic knapsack problem with random sized items. *Operations Research*, 49(1):26–41, 2001.
- [16] Leonard L Lu, Steve Y Chiu, and Louis Anthony Cox Jr. Optimal project selection: Stochastic knapsack with finite time horizon. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 50(6):645–650, 1999.
- [17] Alberto Caprara, Hans Kellerer, Ulrich Pferschy, and David Pisinger. Approximation algorithms for knapsack problems with cardinality constraints. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 123(2):333–345, 2000.
- [18] Yalçın Akçay and Susan H Xu. Joint inventory replenishment and component allocation optimization in an assemble-to-order system. *Management Science*, 50(1):99–116, 2004.
- [19] Marc Mézard and Andrea Montanari. *Information, physics, and computation*. Oxford University Press, 2009.
- [20] Yoshiyuki Kabashima. A cdma multiuser detection algorithm on the basis of belief propagation. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 36(43):11111, 2003.
- [21] Mohsen Bayati and Andrea Montanari. The dynamics of message passing on dense graphs, with applications to compressed sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(2):764–785, 2011.
- [22] Yoshiyuki Kabashima and Shinsuke Uda. A bp-based algorithm for performing bayesian inference in large perceptron-type networks. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 479–493. Springer, 2004.
- [23] Sundeep Rangan. Generalized approximate message passing for estimation with random linear mixing. In *2011 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory Proceedings*, pages 2168–2172. IEEE, 2011.
- [24] Andrea Montanari and David Tse. Analysis of belief propagation for non-linear problems: The example of cdma (or: How to prove tanaka’s formula). In *2006 IEEE Information Theory Workshop-ITW’06 Punta del Este*, pages 160–164. IEEE, 2006.
- [25] Heinz Horner. Dynamics of learning for the binary perceptron problem. *Zeitschrift für Physik B Condensed Matter*, 86(2):291–308, 1992.
- [26] Thomas Peter Minka. *A family of algorithms for approximate Bayesian inference*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2001.
- [27] Manfred Opper, Ole Winther, and Michael J Jordan. Expectation consistent approximate inference. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 6(12), 2005.
- [28] Mattias Ohlsson, Carsten Peterson, and Bo Söderberg. Neural networks for optimization problems with inequality constraints: the knapsack problem. *neural computation*, 5(2):331–339, 1993.
- [29] Google. Or-tools (version 7.2), 2019-7-19.