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Abstract

Motivated by several search and optimization problems over uncertain datasets, we study the stochastic versions of a broad class of combinatorial problems where either the existences or the weights of the elements in the input dataset are uncertain. The class of problems that we study includes shortest paths, minimum weight spanning trees, and minimum weight matchings over probabilistic graphs; top-k queries over probabilistic datasets; and other combinatorial problems like knapsack. By noticing that the expected value is inadequate in capturing different types of risk-averse or risk-prone behaviors, we consider a more general objective which is to maximize the expected utility of the solution for some given utility function, rather than the expected weight (which becomes a special case). For weight uncertainty model, we show that we can obtain a polynomial time approximation algorithm with additive error $\epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, if there is a pseudopolynomial time algorithm for the exact version of the problem\(^1\) (This is true for the problems mentioned above). Our result generalizes several prior works on stochastic shortest path and stochastic knapsack. Then we consider a special case, the expected weight minimization with penalty (EWMP) problem in the element uncertainty model, where each element has a fixed weight but its existence is uncertain. In this problem, the objective is to minimize the expected value of the cost which is the weight of the solution if all elements in the chosen solution are present, or to a fixed penalty otherwise. We show that the problem is NP-hard and present a polynomial time approximation scheme (PTAS) provided we can compute an approximate Pareto curve for the problem in polynomial time. This implies PTASs for the EWMP version of shortest path, matching, and spanning tree (or more generally, matroid base). Our algorithm for utility maximization makes use of the separability of exponential utility and a technique to decompose a general utility function into exponential utility functions, which may be useful in other stochastic optimization problems.

1 Introduction

The most common approach to deal with optimization problems with uncertainty is to optimize the expected value of the solution. However, the expected value is inadequate in expressing diverse people’s preferences towards decision-making under uncertain scenarios. In particular, it fails in capturing the risk-averse or risk-prone type of behaviors that have been commonly observed. For a simple example, many, if not most, people would treat a lottery where we can win 1000 dollars with probability 0.5 and lose 1000 dollars otherwise, and the other choice of doing nothing quite differently, even though both have the same expected value. A more involved but also more surprising example is the St. Petersburg paradox \([1]\) that has been widely used in the economics literature as a criticism of expected value. These observations and criticisms

\(^1\)Following the literature on this topic, we differentiate between exact version and deterministic version of a problem; in the exact version of the problem, we are given a target value and asked to find a solution (e.g., a path) with exactly that value (i.e., path length).
have led people to study the problem from a more fundamental perspective, that is to directly optimize user satisfaction, which is commonly termed as utility. The uncertainty present in the problem instance naturally leads us to optimize the expected utility.

Suppose $PW$ is the set of possible worlds (a.k.a., possible outcomes). Let $F$ be the set of feasible solutions. For instance, in the top-$k$ query, $F$ is the family of all subsets of $k$ tuples while in the minimum spanning tree problem, $F$ is the set of all spanning trees. There is a utility function $\mu : PW \times F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The user could obtain $\mu(Q, pw)$ units of utility in possible world $pw \in PW$ if $Q \in F$ is the chosen solution. We note that the utility depends on both the solution $Q$ and the possible world $pw$. For example, an element $e$ that we have chosen in the answer may have different weights in different possible worlds, thus rendering different utilities. Formally, the expected utility maximization principle is simply stated as follows: The most desirable solution $Q$ is the one that maximizes the expected utility, i.e.,

$$Q = \arg\max_{Q' \in F} \mathbb{E}_{PW}[\mu(Q', pw)]$$

Indeed, the expected utility theory is a branch of the utility theory that studies “betting preferences” of people with regard to uncertain outcomes (gambles). The theory was formally initiated by von Neumann and Morgenstern in 1940s [56, 22] who gave an axiomatization of the theory (known as von Neumann-Morgenstern expected utility theorem). The theory is well known to be versatile in expressing diverse risk-averse or risk-prone behaviors.

In this paper, we focus on the following broad class of combinatorial optimization problems. The deterministic version of the problem is: We are given a ground set of elements $\{e_i\}_{i=1,...,n}$; each element $e$ is associated with a weight $\ell_e$; each feasible solution is a subset of the elements, and our goal is to find a feasible solution $Q$ with the minimum total weight $\ell(Q) = \sum_{e \in Q} \ell_e$. We can see that many combinatorial problems such as shortest path, minimum spanning tree, and minimum weight matching belong to this class. We introduce uncertainty into the problem by considering the following two probabilistic models. The first model is the weight uncertainty model where the weight of each element is an independent random variable. In a particular possible world, if our solution is $Q$, we can obtain a certain amount of utility which is a function of the weight of $Q$. Our goal is to find a solution $Q$ that maximizes the expected utility. We call this problem the expected utility maximization (EUM) problem. It is easy to see that EUM is directly motivated by the expected utility principle.

Let us use the following toy example to illustrate the rationale of EUM. There is a graph with two nodes $s$ and $t$ and two parallel links $e_1$ and $e_2$. $e_1$ has a fixed length 1 while the length of $e_2$ is 0.9 with probability 0.9 and 1.9 with probability 0.1 (the expected value is also 1). We want to choose one edge to connect $s$ and $t$. It is not hard to imagine that a risk-averse user would choose $e_1$ since $e_2$ may turn out to be a much larger value with a nontrivial probability. We can capture such behavior using the utility function (1) (defined in Section 1.1). Similarly, we can capture the risk-prone behavior by using, for example, the convex utility function (3) (defined in Section 3.3). It is easy to see that, in the latter case, $e_2$ maximizes the expected utility.

It is easier to define the second class of problems as penalty minimization problems rather than utility maximization problems. Here we consider element uncertainty, where each element has a fixed weight, but its existence is uncertain. In each possible world, if our solution $Q$ ($Q$ is a subset of elements) is complete, i.e., all elements in $Q$ exist, we pay a cost equal to the weight of $Q$; if some element in $Q$ is not present, we need to pay a fixed penalty $P$ which is given as an input. We call this problem the expected weight minimization with penalty (EWMP) problem. We note that, by varying $P$, we can capture the different user

---

2Daniel Bernoulli developed many ideas, such as risk aversion and utility, in his work *Specimen theoriae novae de mensura sortis* (*Exposition of a New Theory on the Measurement of Risk*) in 1738 [7], but the work had undergone unnoticed for a long time.
attitudes towards the risk of obtaining an infeasible solution. Consider a motivating application where we want to select a route for a packet from $s$ to $t$ in a network where each link may fail with a certain probability. If every link in the path works well, we experience a certain latency which is the sum of latencies of the links along the path. If $t$ does not receive the packet within a fixed deadline $P$, we may simply drop the packet or reselect the route. Our goal is to minimize the expected latency.

We note that the element uncertainty and weight uncertainty models respectively correspond to the tuple uncertainty and attribute uncertainty models proposed in probabilistic database literature.

1.1 Our Contributions

We discuss in detail our result for the EUM problem in the weight uncertainty model. We assume that the utility function $\mu(x)$ is always between $[0,1]$. Moreover, we assume $\lim_{x \to \infty} \mu(x) = 0$. This captures the fact that if the weight of solution is too large, it becomes almost useless for us. We say a function $\tilde{\mu}(x)$ is an $\epsilon$-approximation of $\mu(x)$ if $|\tilde{\mu}(x) - \mu(x)| \leq \epsilon \forall x \geq 0$. Recall that a polynomial time approximation scheme (PTAS) is an algorithm which takes an instance of a minimization problem and a parameter $\epsilon$ and produces a solution whose cost is within a factor $1 + \epsilon$ of the optimum, and the running time, for any fixed $\epsilon$, is polynomial in the size of the input. A pseudopolynomial time algorithm is an algorithm runs in time polynomial in $n$ and the values of the weights. Our first main theorem is the following. We use $A$ to denote the combinatorial optimization problem under consideration.

**Theorem 1** Assume that there is a pseudopolynomial algorithm for the exact version of $A$ (recall that this is the version of the problem where we are asked to find a solution with a specific weight). Further assume that given any $\epsilon > 0$, we can find an $\epsilon$-approximation of the utility function $\mu$ as $\tilde{\mu}(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{L} c_k \phi_k^x$, where $L$ is a constant depending on $\mu$ and $\epsilon$. Then, there is an algorithm that runs in time polynomial in $n$ and $1/\epsilon$ and possibly exponential in $L$, that approximates $EUM(A)$ with an additive error $O(\epsilon)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. If the optimal solution has an expected utility of $\Theta(1)$, we obtain a PTAS.

For many combinatorial problems, a pseudopolynomial algorithm for the exact version is known. Examples include shortest path, spanning tree, matching and knapsack. Hence, the only task left is to find a short exponential sum that $\epsilon$-approximates $\mu$. For this purpose, we adopt the Fourier series technique. However, the technique cannot be used directly since it works only for periodic functions with bounded periodicities. In order to get a good approximation for $x \in [0, \infty)$, we leverage the fact that $\lim_{x \to \infty} \mu(x) = 0$ and develop a general framework that uses the Fourier series decomposition as a subroutine. In general, such an approximation is only possible if the function is “well behaved”, namely satisfies some continuity or smoothness conditions. In particular, we show the following theorem.

**Theorem 2** If the original utility function $\mu$ satisfies the $\alpha$-Hölder condition $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq C|x - y|^\alpha$, for some constant $C$ and some constant $\alpha > 1/2$, then, for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$, we can obtain an exponential sum with $O(1)$ terms which is an $\epsilon$-approximation of $\mu$ for $x \geq 0$.

Consider the utility function

$$
\tilde{\chi}(x) = \begin{cases} 
1 & x \in [0, 1] \\
\frac{x}{\delta} + \frac{1}{\delta} + 1 & x \in [1, 1 + \delta] \\
0 & x > 1 + \delta
\end{cases}
$$

(1)
where $\delta > 0$ is a small constant. We can verify that $\tilde{\chi}$ satisfies 1-Hölder condition with $C = \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, Theorem 2 is applicable. This example is interesting since it can be viewed as a “smoothed” version of the threshold function

$$\chi(x) = \begin{cases} 
1 & x \in [0,1] \\
0 & x > 1
\end{cases},$$

for which maximizing the expected utility is equivalent to maximizing $\Pr(\ell(Q) \leq 1)$, which has been considered several times, for stochastic shortest path [42], stochastic knapsack [24] and some other stochastic problems [2, 41].

It is interesting to compare our result with the result for the stochastic shortest path problem by Nikolova et al. [42, 41]. In [42], they show that there is an exact $O(n \log n)$ time algorithm for maximizing $\Pr(\ell(Q) \leq 1)$ if all edges are normally distributed and there is a path that has a mean at most 1. Later, Nikolova [41] extends the result to a PTAS for any problem that can be solved exactly by linear programming under the same assumptions. We can see that under such assumptions, the optimal probability is at least $1/2$. Therefore, provided the same assumption and further assuming that $\Pr(\ell_e < 0)$ is miniscule, our algorithm is a PTAS for the smoothed version of the problem. Indeed, we can translate this result to a bi-criterion approximation result of the following form: For any fixed $\delta, \epsilon > 0$, we can find in polynomial time a solution $Q$ such that

$$\Pr(\ell(Q) \leq 1 + \delta) \geq (1 - \epsilon) \Pr(\ell(Q^*) \leq 1),$$

where $O^*$ is the optimal solution (Corollary 2). We note that such a bi-criterion approximation was only known for exponentially distributed edges [42].

Let us consider another application of our results to the stochastic knapsack problems defined in [24]. Given a set $U$ of independent random variables $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$, with associated profits $\{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ and an overflow probability $\gamma$, pick a subset $Q$ of $U$ such that

$$\Pr(\sum_{i \in Q} x_i \geq 1) \leq \gamma$$

and the total profit $\sum_{i \in Q} v_i$ is maximized. Goel and Indyk [24] showed that, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a polynomial time algorithm that can find a solution $Q$ with the profit at least the optimum and $\Pr(\sum_{i \in Q} x_i \geq 1 + \epsilon) \leq \gamma(1 + \epsilon)$ for exponentially distributed variables. Quite recently, in parallel with our work, Bhalgat et al. [11] obtained the same result for arbitrary distributions under the assumption that $\gamma = \Theta(1)$. Their technique is based on discretizing the distributions and is quite involved. Our result, applied to stochastic knapsack, matches that of Bhalgat et al. and has a much better running time (Corollary 3). We would like to remark that our technique is completely different and much simpler. Despite a little loss in the approximation guarantees in some cases, our technique can be applied to almost all other probability distributions, and a much richer class of utility functions, that are beyond the reach of the current techniques.

We briefly summarize our result for EWMP. EWMP is a special case of EUM. However, the utility function corresponding to EWMP is not smooth enough and cannot be solved using the technique discussed before. We first show the decision version of the problem is NP-complete (Theorem 6). We show if we can compute an $\epsilon$-approximation Pareto curve for problem $A$, in polynomial time, for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$, we can obtain a PTAS for EWMP(A) (Theorem 7). The notion of an $\epsilon$-approximation Pareto curve was proposed by Papadimitriou and Yannakakis [44] in the context of multi-criteria optimization. Many problems, such as shortest path, spanning tree and matching, are known to have polynomially computable $\epsilon$-approximation Pareto curves. Thus, we obtain PTASs for these problems.

3Our technique can only handle distributions with positive supports. Thus, we have to assume the probability that a negative value appears is miniscule and can be safely ignored.
1.2 Related Work

In recent years stochastic optimization problems have drawn much attention from the computer science community where stochastic versions of several classical combinatorial optimization problems have been studied. In particular, a significant portion of the efforts has been devoted to the two-stage stochastic optimization problem. In such a problem, we are given in a first stage probabilistic information about the input and the cost of selecting an item is low; in a second stage, the actual input is revealed but the costs for the elements are higher. We are asked to make decision after each stage and minimize the expected cost. Some general techniques have been developed [29, 50]. We refer interested reader to [55] for a comprehensive survey. Another widely studied type of problem considers designing probing policies for stochastic optimization problems where the existence or the exact weight of an element can be only known upon a probe. There is typically a budget for the number of probes (see e.g., [27, 16]), or we require an irrevocable decision whether to include the probed element in the solution right after the probe (see e.g., [21, 14, 3]). However, most of those works focus on optimizing the expected value of the solution. There are also sporadic works on optimizing the overflow probability or some other objectives subject to the overflow probability constraints. In particular, a few recent works have explicitly motivated such objectives as a way to capture the risk-averse type of behaviors [2, 41, 54]. Besides those works, there has been little work on optimizing more general utility functions for combinatorial stochastic optimization problems from the approximation algorithm perspective.

The most related work is the stochastic shortest path problem (Stoch-SP), which was also the initial motivation for this work. The problem has been studied extensively for several special utility functions in operation research community. Sigal et al. [51] studied the problem of finding the path with greatest probability of being the shortest path. Loui showed that Stoch-SP reduces to the shortest path (and sometimes longest path) problem if the utility function is linear or exponential [36]. Much work considered dealing with more general utility functions, such as piecewise linear or concave functions, e.g., [39, 40, 5]. However, these algorithms are essentially heuristics and the worst case running times are still exponential. Nikolova et al. studied the problem of maximizing the probability that the length of the chosen path is less than some given parameter [42]. Besides the result we mentioned before, they also considered Poisson and exponential distributions. Despite much effort on this problem, no algorithm is known to run in polynomial time and have provable performance guarantees, especially for more general utility functions or more general distributions. This is perhaps because the hardness comes from different sources, as also noted in [42]: the shortest path selection per se is combinatorial; the distribution of the length of a path is the convolution of the distributions of its edges; the objective is nonlinear; to list a few.

Recently, Francesco et al. [45] considered the distance and nearest neighbor queries over uncertain graphs where the existences of the edges are uncertain. However, their focus was estimating the distance distribution or some quantiles between two nodes, rather than finding a particular path.

Kleinberg et al. [32] first considered the stochastic knapsack problem with Bernoulli-type distributions and provided a polynomial-time \(O(\log 1/\gamma)\) approximation where \(\gamma\) is the given overflow probability. For item sizes with exponential distributions, Goel and Indyk [24] provided a bi-criterion PTAS, and for Bernoulli-distributed items they gave a quasi-polynomial approximation scheme. Chekuri and Khanna [13] pointed out that a PTAS can be obtained for the Bernoulli case using their techniques for the multiple knapsack problem. Quite recently, Bhalgat, Goel and Khanna [11] developed a general discretization technique that reduces the distributions to a small number of equivalent classes which we can efficiently enumerate for both adaptive and nonadaptive versions of stochastic knapsack. They used this technique to obtain improved results for several variants of stochastic knapsack.

There has been much recent work on managing uncertainty in relational database systems. This work has
spanned a range of issues from theoretical development of data models and data languages to practical im-
plementation issues such as indexing techniques, and several research efforts are underway to build systems
to manage uncertain data, see e.g., [20, 57, 49, 30]. There has also been much work on efficiently answering
other types of queries over probabilistic databases, including top-k queries [52, 18, 33, 35], aggregates [31],
summarization [17], clustering [19, 28], and so on.

This work is partially inspired by our prior work on top-k and other queries over probabilistic datasets [33, 35]. In fact, we can show that both the consensus answers proposed in [33] and the parameterized ranking functions proposed in [35] follow the expected utility maximization principle where the utility functions are materialized as distance metrics for the former and the weight functions for the latter. Our technique for EUM is also similar to the approximation scheme used in [35] in spirit. However, no performance guarantees are provided in that work.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Probabilistic Models

Our input instance consists of a set of elements \( U = \{e_1, \ldots, e_n\} \). For each \( i \), the weight of element \( e_i \) is \( \ell_i \), which may be a random variable. Let \( F \) denote the set of feasible solutions. For instance, \( F \) is the set of s-t paths in the shortest path problem. For each subset \( Q \subset U \), we use \( \ell(Q) \) to denote the total weight of \( Q \), i.e., \( \sum_{e \in Q} \ell_e \). We focus on the following two prevalent probabilistic models.

1. (Element Uncertainty Model) Each element \( e \) exists independently with probability \( p_e \) and has a fixed length \( c_e \) when exists. In another word, \( \ell_e = \begin{cases} c_e, & \text{w.p. } p_e; \\ \infty, & \text{w.p. } 1 - p_e. \end{cases} \)

2. (Weight Uncertainty Model) Each element \( e \) always exists and \( \ell_e \) is a random variable. We use \( p_e(.) \) to denote its probability density function (or probability mass function in discrete case). We assume all \( \ell_e \)s are non-negative, or \( \Pr(\ell_e < 0) \) is extremely small and thus can be ignored.

The element uncertainty model can be seen as the tuple uncertainty model in probabilistic relations whereas the weight uncertainty model can be seen as the attribute uncertainty model.

2.2 Formal Problem Definition

We mainly consider two objective functions. One is defined in the weight uncertainty model and the other is in the element uncertainty model.

**Expected Utility Maximization (EUM):** We consider the weight uncertainty model. Assuming there is a utility function \( \mu : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+ \) which is a function of the weight of the solution, the EUM principle says the “best” solution is the feasible solution \( Q \in F \) that maximizes

\[
\mathbb{E}[\mu(\ell(Q))] = \int \mu(x)p_Q(x)dx,
\]

where \( p_Q \) is the pdf of the random quantity \( \ell(Q) = \sum_{e \in Q} \ell_e \). We assume \( 0 \leq \mu(x) \leq 1 \) for \( x \geq 0 \) and \( \lim_{x \to +\infty} \mu(x) = 0 \).

**Expected Weight Minimization with Penalty (EWMP):** We also consider an important special case of EUM. In the element uncertainty model, there is a non-zero probability that some element in a particular
solution $Q$ is not present. We would like to minimize the expected weight of the chosen solution as well as the probability that $Q$ is infeasible. Therefore, a tradeoff of these two objectives is required. For this purpose, we incur a penalty $P$ if some element in $Q$ is not present. Our overall objective is to find a solution $Q \in F$ such that

$$
\mathbb{E}[\ell^P(Q)] = \prod_{e \in Q} p_e \sum_{e \in Q} c_e + (1 - \prod_{e \in Q} p_e) P
$$

is minimized. It is easy to see this is a special case of EUM where the corresponding utility function is $\ell^P(x) = x$ if $x$ is finite and $\ell^P(\infty) = P$. For this special case, we can use a different technique to obtain stronger results.

3 Weight Uncertainty Model

In this section, we consider EUM in weight uncertainty model. We first note that the problem is #P-hard in general since the problem of computing the overflow probability of a set of items with Bernoulli distributions, a very special case of our problem, is #P-hard [32].

Our approach is conceptually very simple. We first approximate the utility function $\mu(x)$ by a short exponential sum, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^L c_i \phi_i^x$ with $L$ being a constant. Hence, $\mathbb{E}[\mu(\ell(Q))]$ can be approximated by $\sum_{i=1}^L c_i \mathbb{E}[\phi_i^x]$. Then, we solve the multi-criterion version of the problem with objectives $\mathbb{E}[\phi_i^x], \ldots, \mathbb{E}[\phi_L^x]$ by making use of the “separability” of the exponential functions.

In Section 3.1, we show how to solve our problem provided that a short exponential sum approximation of $\mu$ is given. In particular, we prove Theorem 1. In Section 3.2, we discuss how to compute exactly or approximate $\mathbb{E}[\phi_i^x]$ for different distributions. We prove Theorem 2 in Section 3.3 and Section 3.4. Then, in Section 3.5, we consider two applications, the stochastic shortest path problem and the stochastic knapsack problem, and obtain more general results than previous work. We discuss some possible extensions at the end of this section.

3.1 The Algorithm

Let us first consider the exponential utility function $\mu(x) = \alpha^x$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. Fix an arbitrary solution $Q$. Due to the independence of the elements, we can easily see that

$$
\mathbb{E}[\alpha^{\ell(Q)}] = \mathbb{E}[\alpha^{\sum_{e \in Q} \ell_e}] = \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{e \in Q} \alpha^{\ell_e}\right] = \prod_{e \in Q} \mathbb{E}[\alpha^{\ell_e}]
$$

Taking log on both sides, we get $\log \mathbb{E}[\alpha^{\ell(Q)}] = \sum_{e \in Q} \log \mathbb{E}[\alpha^{\ell_e}]$. If $\mathbb{E}[\alpha^{\ell_e}] \leq 1$ (or equivalently, $-\log \mathbb{E}[\alpha^{\ell_e}] \geq 0$), this again reduces to the ordinary shortest path problem which can be easily solved in polynomial time. Indeed, the separability of the exponential utility function was first noticed by Loui [36].

We say the exponential sum $\sum_{i=1}^L c_i \phi_i^x$ $\epsilon$-approximates $\mu(x)$ if the following holds:

$$
|\mu(x) - \sum_{i=1}^L c_i \phi_i^x| \leq \epsilon \quad \forall x \geq 0
$$

We first show that if the utility function can be decomposed exactly into a short exponential sum, we can approximate the expected utility well.
Theorem 3 Assume $\tilde{\mu}(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{L} c_k \phi^e_k$ is the utility function where $|\phi_k| \leq 1 \forall k$ and $L = O(1)$. We also assume that there is a pseudopolynomial algorithm for the exact version of $A$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is an algorithm that runs in polynomial time and finds a solution $Q$ such that

$$|E[\tilde{\mu}(\ell(Q))] - E[\tilde{\mu}(\ell(Q^*))]| < \epsilon$$

where $Q^*$ is the solution maximizing $|E[\tilde{\mu}(\ell(Q^*))]|$.

Before proving Theorem 3, we show Theorem 1 can be easily obtained from Theorem 3 and the fact $\tilde{\mu}$ is an $\epsilon$-approximation of $\mu$.

**Proof of Theorem 1:** Suppose $Q$ is our solution and $Q^*$ is the optimal solution. From Theorem 3, we know that $|E[\tilde{\mu}(\ell(Q))]| \geq E[\tilde{\mu}(\ell(Q^*))] - \epsilon$. Since $\tilde{\mu}$ is an $\epsilon$-approximation of $\mu$, we can see that

$$|E[\mu(\ell(S))] - E[\tilde{\mu}(\ell(S))]| = \left| \int (\mu(x) - \tilde{\mu}(x)) p_S(x) dx \right| \leq \left| \int \epsilon p_S(x) dx \right| \leq \epsilon$$

for any solution $S$. Therefore,

$$|E[\mu(\ell(Q))]| \geq |E[\tilde{\mu}(\ell(Q))]| - \epsilon \geq |E[\tilde{\mu}(\ell(Q^*))]| - 2\epsilon \geq |E[\mu(\ell(Q^*))]| - 3\epsilon$$

The proof is complete. $\square$

Now, we prove Theorem 3. We use the rounding technique that has been used often in multi-criterion optimization problems. We use $|c|$ and $\arg(c)$ to denote the absolute value and the phase of the complex number $c$. Let $\gamma = \delta = \frac{\epsilon}{L\pi}$. For each $e \in U$, we associate it with a $2L$ dimensional integer vector

$$\langle a_1(e), b_1(e), \ldots, a_L(e), b_L(e) \rangle$$

where $a_i(e) = \left\lfloor -\frac{\ln|E[\phi^e_i]|}{\gamma} \right\rfloor$ and $b_i(e) = \left\lfloor \frac{\arg(E[\phi^e_i])}{\delta} \right\rfloor$. For each node $v$, we maintain $(JK)^L$ configurations where $J = \left\lfloor -\frac{\ln(e/L)}{\gamma} \right\rfloor$ and $K = \left\lfloor \frac{2\pi a}{\delta} \right\rfloor$. Each configuration is indexed by a $2L$-dimensional vector. For node $v$ and vector $a = \langle \alpha_1, \beta_1, \ldots, \alpha_L, \beta_L \rangle$, configuration $\sigma_v(a) = 1$ if and only if there is a solution $Q$ such that for all $j = 1, \ldots, L$,

1. $\sum_{e \in Q} b_j(e) = \beta_j$, and
2. $\alpha_j = J$ if $\sum_{e \in Q} a_j(e) > J$ and $\alpha_j = \sum_{e \in Q} a_j(e)$ otherwise.

The following lemma tells us the expected utility for the rounded instance is close to the true value of the expected utility.

**Lemma 1** For node $v$ and vector $a = \langle \alpha_1, \beta_1, \ldots, \alpha_L, \beta_L \rangle$, configuration $\sigma_v(a) = 1$ if and only if there is a solution $Q$ such that

$$|E[\tilde{\mu}(\ell(Q))] - \sum_{k=1}^{L} c_k e^{-\alpha_k \gamma + i\beta_k \delta}| \leq O(\epsilon).$$

**Proof:** We first notice that

$$E[\tilde{\mu}(\ell(Q))] = E[\sum_{k=1}^{L} c_k \phi^e_k] = \sum_{k=1}^{L} c_k E[\phi^e_k].$$
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Therefore, it suffices to show that for all $k = 1, \ldots, L$,

$$|\mathbb{E}[\phi_k^{(Q)}] - e^{-\alpha_k \gamma + i \beta_k \delta}| \leq O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{L}\right).$$

First, we can see that

$$\arg(\mathbb{E}[\phi_k^{(Q)}]) - \beta_k \delta = \sum_{e \in Q} (\arg(\mathbb{E}[\phi_k^{e}]) - b_k(e) \delta) \leq \sum_{e \in Q} \delta \leq n \delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{L}.$$  

If $\sum_{e \in Q} \alpha_k(e) > J$, we know that

$$-\ln(|\mathbb{E}[\phi_k^{(Q)}]|) = \sum_{e \in Q} (-\ln(|\mathbb{E}[\phi_k^e]|)) > J \gamma.$$  

Thus, we have

$$\left| |\mathbb{E}[\phi_k^{(Q)}]| - |e^{-\alpha_k \gamma}| \right| < e^{-J \gamma} = e^{\gamma \left\lfloor \frac{\ln(\varepsilon/L)}{\gamma} \right\rfloor} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{L}.$$  

If $\sum_{e \in Q} \alpha_k(e) \leq J$, we can see that

$$-\ln(|\mathbb{E}[\phi_k^{(Q)}]|) - \alpha_k \gamma = \sum_{e \in Q} (-\ln(|\mathbb{E}[\phi_k^e]|) - \alpha_k(e) \gamma) \leq \sum_{e \in Q} \gamma \leq n \gamma \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{L}.$$  

Since the derivative of $e^x$ is less than 1 for $x < 0$, we can get

$$\left| |\mathbb{E}[\phi_k^{(Q)}]| - |e^{-\alpha_k \gamma}| \right| \leq |e^{-\alpha_k \gamma} - e^{-\alpha_k \gamma}| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{L}.$$  

For any two complex numbers $a, b$ with $|a| \leq 1$ and $|b| \leq 1$, if $|a - b| < h$ and $|\arg(a) - \arg(b)| < h$, we have $|a - b| < O(h)$. The proof is complete. \hfill $\square$

The following lemma shows how to compute those configurations.

**Lemma 2** Suppose there is a pseudopolynomial time algorithm for the exact version of $A$, which runs in time polynomial in $n$ and $t$ ($t$ is the maximum integer in the instance of $A$). Then, we can compute the values for these configurations in time $(\frac{n}{\varepsilon})^{O(L)}$.

**Proof:** For this purpose, we slightly modify the vector associated with each edge $e$ as follows: If $\alpha_i(e) > J$, we let the new $\alpha_i(e)$ value be $n(J + 1)$. For each node $v$ and each vector $a = (\alpha_1, \beta_1, \ldots, \alpha_L, \beta_L)$ such that $0 \leq \alpha_i \leq n^2(J+1)\forall i$ and $0 \leq \beta_i \leq K \forall i$, we want to compute the value $\tilde{\sigma}_v(a)$ which is defined as follows: $\tilde{\sigma}_v(a) = 1$ if and only if there is a solution $Q$ such that for all $j = 1, \ldots, L$, $\sum_{e \in Q} b_j(e) = \beta_j$, and $\alpha_j = \sum_{e \in Q} a_j(e)$; $\tilde{\sigma}_v(a) = 0$ otherwise. Suppose the pseudopolynomial time algorithm runs in time $P_A(n, t)$ for some polynomial $P_A$. We can encode vector $a$ as an integer bounded by $(n^2JK)^L = (\frac{n}{\varepsilon})^{O(L)}$. Therefore, we can see the value of each such $\tilde{\sigma}_v(a)$ can be also computed in time $P_A(n, (\frac{n}{\varepsilon})^{O(L)}) = (\frac{n}{\varepsilon})^{O(L)}$. Since $J$ and $K$ are bounded by $(\frac{n}{\varepsilon})^{O(1)}$, the total number of different $\tilde{\sigma}(a)$ is $(\frac{n}{\varepsilon})^{O(L)}$. The values of the $\sigma$ configurations can be easily answered from the values of $\tilde{\sigma}$s:

1. If $\alpha_i < J \forall i$, $\sigma_v(a) = \tilde{\sigma}_v(a)$;
2. Denote $a' = (\alpha'_1, \beta'_1, \ldots, \alpha'_L, \beta'_L)$ and $S = \{i \mid \alpha_i = J\}$. $\sigma_v(a) = \max_{a'}(\tilde{\sigma}_v(a')) | \beta'_i = \beta_i \forall i \in [L], \alpha'_i \geq J \forall i \in S, \alpha'_i = \alpha_i \forall i \notin S$.

Therefore, the total running time is $(\frac{n}{\varepsilon})^{O(L)}$ which is a polynomial in $n$ if $L$ is a constant.

It is easy to see that Theorem 3 follows from Lemma 1 and Lemma 2.
3.2 Computing $\mathbb{E}[\alpha^{\ell_e}]$

If $\ell_e$ is a discrete random variable with a polynomial size support, we can easily compute $\mathbb{E}[\alpha^{\ell_e}]$ in polynomial time. If $\ell_e$ has an infinite even continuous support, we can not compute $\mathbb{E}[\alpha^{\ell_e}]$ directly and may need approximation sometimes.

If $X$ is a random variable, then the characteristic function of $X$ is defined as

$$G(z) = \mathbb{E}[e^{izX}].$$

We can see $\mathbb{E}[\alpha^{\ell_e}]$ is nothing but the value of the characteristic function of $\ell_e$ evaluated at $-i \ln \alpha$ (here $\ln$ is the complex logarithm function). For many important distributions, including negative binomial, Poisson, exponential, Gaussian, Chi-square and Gamma, a closed-form characteristic function is known. See [43] for a more comprehensive list.

**Example 1** Consider the Poisson distributed $\ell_e$ with mean $\lambda$, i.e., $\Pr(\ell_e = k) = \lambda^k e^{-\lambda}/k!$. Its characteristic function is known to be $G(z) = e^{\lambda(e^{iz}-1)}$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[\alpha^{\ell_e}] = G(-i \ln \alpha) = e^{\lambda(\alpha^{-1})}.$$

**Example 2** For Gaussian distribution $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$, we know its characteristic function is $G(z) = e^{iz\mu - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 z^2}$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[\alpha^{\ell_e}] = G(-i \ln \alpha) = \alpha^{\mu + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 \ln \alpha}.$$

For some continuous distributions, no closed-form characteristic function is known and we need proper numerical approximation method. If the support of the distribution is bounded, we can use for example Gauss-Legendre quadrature [46]. If the support is infinite, we can either (1) truncate the distribution and approximate the integral over the remaining finite interval; (2) use a quadrature formula developed for infinite interval, such as Gauss-Laguerre quadrature [46]. Generally speaking a quadrature method approximates $\int_a^b f(x)dx$ by a linear sum $\sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i f(x_i)$ where $c_i$ and $x_i$ are some constants independent of the function $f$. A typical practice is to use composite rule, that is to partition $[a, b]$ into $N$ subintervals and approximate the integral using some quadrature formula over each subinterval. For the example of Gauss-Laguerre quadrature, assuming continuity of the $2k$th derivative of $f(x)$ for some constant $k$, if we partition $[a, b]$ into $M$ subintervals and apply Gauss-Legendre quadrature of degree $k$ to each subinterval, the approximation error is

$$\text{Error} = \frac{(b - a)^{2k+1}}{M^{2k}} \frac{(k!)^4}{(2k + 1)![(2k)!]^2} f^{(2k)}(\xi)$$

where $\xi$ is some point in $(a, b)$ [46, pp.116]. Let $\Delta = \frac{b - a}{M}$. If we treat $k$ as a constant, the behavior of the error (in terms of $\Delta$) is $\text{Error}(\Delta) = O(\Delta^{2k} \max_{\xi} f^{(2k)}(\xi))$. Therefore, if the support and $\max_{\xi} f^{(2k)}(\xi)$ are bounded by a polynomial, we can approximate the integral, in polynomial time, such that the error is $O(1/n^{\beta})$ for any fixed integer $\beta$.

The next lemma shows that we do not lose too much even though we can only get an approximation of $\mathbb{E}[\alpha^{\ell_e}]$.

**Lemma 3** Suppose in Theorem 3, we can only compute an approximate value of $\mathbb{E}[q_i^{\ell_e}]$, denoted by $E_{e,i}$, for each $e$ and $i$, such that $|\mathbb{E}[q_i^{\ell_e}] - E_{e,i}| \leq O(n^{-\beta})$ for some positive integer $\beta$. Denote $E(Q) = \sum_{k=1}^{L} c_k \prod_{e \in Q} E_{e,i}$. For any solution $Q$, we have that

$$|\mathbb{E}[\bar{\mu}(\ell(Q))] - E(Q)| \leq O(n^{1-\beta}).$$
Proof: We need the following simple result (see [34] for a proof): \( a_1, \ldots, a_n \) and \( e_1, \ldots, e_n \) are complex numbers such that \( |a_i| \leq 1 \) and \( |e_i| \leq n^{-\beta} \) for all \( i \) and some \( \beta > 1 \). Then, we have
\[
\left| \prod_{i=1}^{n} (a_i + e_i) - \prod_{i=1}^{n} E_i \right| \leq O(n^{1-\beta}).
\]
Since \( |\phi_i| \leq 1 \), we can see that
\[
|\mathbb{E}[\phi_i^k]| = \left| \int_{x \geq 0} \phi^2 p_e(x) dx \right| \leq 1.
\]
The lemma simply follows by applying the above result and noticing that \( L \) and all \( c_k \)s are constants. □

We can show that Theorem 1 still holds even though we only have the approximations of the \( \mathbb{E}[\alpha^k] \) values. The proof is straightforward and omitted.

3.3 Approximating the Utility Function

In this subsection, we discuss the issue of approximating \( \mu \). In particular, we develop a generic algorithm that takes as a subroutine an algorithm \( \text{Alg} \) for approximating functions in a bounded interval domain, and can approximate \( \mu(x) \) in the infinite domain \([0, +\infty)\). In the next subsection, we use the Fourier series expansion as the choice of \( \text{Alg} \) and show an important class of utility functions can be approximated well.

Actually, there are many works on approximating functions using short exponential sums, e.g., [8, 9, 10]. However, their approximation are done over a finite interval domain, say \([-\pi, \pi]\) or over a finite number of discrete points. No error bound can be guaranteed outside the domain. Our algorithm is a generic procedure that turns an algorithm that can approximate functions over \([-\pi, \pi]\) into one over \([0, +\infty)\). Some works also consider using linear combinations of Gaussians or other kernels to approximate functions with finite support over the entire real axis \((-\infty, +\infty)\) [15]. This is however impossible for exponentials since \( \alpha^x \) is either periodic (if \( |\alpha| = 1 \)) or approaches to infinity when \( x \to +\infty \) or \( x \to -\infty \) (if \( |\alpha| \neq 1 \)).

Since \( \lim_{x \to \infty} \mu(x) = 0 \), for any \( \epsilon \), there exist a point \( T_\epsilon \) such that \( \mu(x) \leq \epsilon \ \forall x > T_\epsilon \). For ease of discussion, we assume the utility function \( \mu \) is specified as a part of the problem but not a part of the particular input instance. Therefore, we can consider \( T_\epsilon \) as a constant for any fixed \( \epsilon \). We will discuss how to relax this assumption in Section 3.6. We also assume there is an algorithm \( \text{Alg} \) such that for any function \( f \) (under some condition specified later) it can produce an exponential sum \( \hat{f}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{L} c_i \phi_i^x \) which is an \( \epsilon \)-approximation of \( f(x) \) in \([-\pi, \pi]\). Our goal is to produce an exponential sum such that it is an \( \epsilon \)-approximation for \( \mu(x) \) in \([0, +\infty)\).

We denote this procedure by \textsc{UTI-DECOMP}.

1. Initially, we slightly change function \( \mu(x) \) to a new function \( \hat{\mu}(x) \) as follows: We require \( \hat{\mu}(x) \) is a “smooth” function in \([-2T_\epsilon, 2T_\epsilon]\) such that \( \hat{\mu}(x) = \mu(x) \) for all \( x \in [0, T_\epsilon] \); \( \hat{\mu}(2T_\epsilon) = 0 \) and \( \hat{\mu}(-2T_\epsilon) = 0 \); \( \hat{\mu}(x) = 0 \) for \( |x| > 2T_\epsilon \). We do not specify the exact smoothness requirements now since they may be different for different algorithms \( \text{Alg} \) we used here. Note that there may be many \( \hat{\mu}s \) that satisfy the conditions. We will discuss this issue in more detail later. We note that the only properties we need are (1) \( \hat{\mu} \) is amendable to algorithm \( \text{Alg} \); (2) \( |\hat{\mu}(x) - \mu(x)| \leq \epsilon \ \forall x \geq 0 \).

2. We apply \( \text{Alg} \) to \( f(x) = \eta^x \hat{\mu}(x) \) over domain \([-hT_\epsilon, hT_\epsilon]\) (\( \eta \) and \( h \geq 2 \) are constants to be determined later). Suppose the resulting exponential sum \( \hat{f}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{L} c_i \phi_i^x \) which is a \( \epsilon \)-approximation of \( f \) on \([-hT_\epsilon, hT_\epsilon]\). Note that \( L \) is a constant depending only on \( \epsilon \) and \( f \).

3. Let \( \tilde{\mu}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{L} c_i (\frac{\eta}{\eta})^x \), which is our final approximation of \( \mu(x) \) on \([0, \infty)\).
Example 3 Consider the utility function
\[ \mu(x) = \frac{1}{x + 1}. \] (3)

Let \( T_\epsilon = \frac{1}{\epsilon} - 1 \). So \( \mu(x) < \epsilon \) for all \( x > T_\epsilon \). Now we create function \( \hat{\mu}(x) \) according to the first step of UTI-DECOMP. If we only require \( \hat{\mu}(x) \) to be continuous, then we can use, for instance, the following piecewise function:
\[
\hat{\mu}(x) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{x+1} & x \in [0, T_\epsilon], \\
\frac{x}{x^2 + 2x} & x \in [T_\epsilon, 2T_\epsilon], \\
0 & x > 2T_\epsilon.
\end{cases}
\]

By setting \( \eta = 2 \max_i |\phi_i| \) and
\[
h \geq \frac{\log(\sum_{i=1}^{L} |c_i|/\epsilon)}{T_\epsilon},
\] (4)
we can show the following theorem.

Theorem 4 \( \hat{\mu}(x) \) is a 2-\( \epsilon \)-approximation of \( \mu(x) \)

Proof: We know that \( |\hat{f}(x) - f(x)| \leq \epsilon \) for \( x \in [0, hT_\epsilon] \). Therefore, we have that
\[
|\hat{\mu}(x) - \mu(x)| = \left| \frac{\hat{f}(x)}{\eta^x} - \frac{f(x)}{\eta^x} \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\eta^x} \leq \epsilon.
\]
Combining with \( |\hat{\mu}(x) - \mu(x)| \leq \epsilon \), we obtain \( |\hat{\mu}(x) - \mu(x)| \leq 2\epsilon \) for \( x \in [0, hT_\epsilon] \). For \( x > hT_\epsilon \), we can see that
\[
|\hat{\mu}(x)| = \sum_{i=1}^{L} c_i \left( \frac{\phi_i}{\eta} \right)^x \leq \sum_{i=1}^{L} |c_i| \left( \frac{\phi_i}{\eta} \right)^x \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{L} |c_i| \leq \frac{1}{2hT_\epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^{L} |c_i| \leq \epsilon
\]
Since \( \mu(x) < \epsilon \) for \( x > hT_\epsilon \), the proof is complete. \( \square \)

Remark: It appears that the requirement \( h \geq \frac{\log(\sum_{i=1}^{L} |c_i|/\epsilon)}{T_\epsilon} \) is convoluted in that the domain \([-hT_\epsilon, hT_\epsilon]\) over which we apply Alg depends on the result of Alg (i.e., the coefficients \( c_i \)'s). Moreover, the bound on \( L \), as we show shortly, also depends on \( h \). In fact, in many cases, we can obtain an upper bound on \( \sum_{i=1}^{L} |c_i| \) before we apply Alg, and the bound is a constant independent of \( c_i \)'s and \( L \). In the next subsection, we use the Fourier series decomposition as the choice for Alg, which can provide such an upper bound if the function is smooth enough (“smoothness” to be specified later). In any case, we should keep in mind that \( L \), \( h \) are constants that may depend on the specified error bound \( \epsilon \).

3.4 A Particular Choice of Alg: The Fourier Series Approach

Now, we discuss the choice of algorithm Alg and the conditions that \( f(x) \) needs to satisfy so that it is possible to approximate \( f(x) \) by a short exponential sum in a bounded interval. In fact, if we know in advance that there is a short exponential sum that can approximate \( f \), we can use the algorithms developed in [9, 10] (for continuous case) and [8] (for discrete case). However, those work does not provide an easy characterization
of the class of functions. From now on, we restrict ourselves to the classic Fourier series technique, which has been studied extensively and allows such characterizations.

In UTI-DECOMP, we need to apply Alg to \( f(x) \) on the domain \([-hT_\epsilon, hT_\epsilon]\). Without loss of generality, we can assume the domain is \([-\pi, \pi]\). Otherwise, we can scale the utility function by considering another function \( f(x : \frac{hT_\epsilon}{\pi}) \), and then scale the obtained approximation back to \([-hT_\epsilon, hT_\epsilon]\). Consider the partial sum of the Fourier series of the function \( f(x) \):

\[
(S_N f)(x) = \sum_{k=-N}^{N} c_k e^{ikx}
\]

where the Fourier coefficient

\[
c_k = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(x)e^{-ikx} dx.
\]

It has \( L = 2N + 1 \) terms. Since \( f(x) \) is a real function, we have \( c_k = c_{-k} \) and the partial sum is also real. We are interested in the question on which conditions does the function \( S_N f \) converge to \( f \) and what is convergence rate? Roughly speaking, the more “smoothness” \( f \) has, the faster \( S_N f \) converges to \( f \). However, in general, this question is extremely intricate and deep and is one of the central topics in the area of harmonic analysis. In the following, we give one classic result about the convergence of Fourier series and show how to use it in our problem. Then we provide a few concrete examples.

The function \( f \) is said to be of class \( C^p[a,b] \) if the derivatives \( f^{(1)}, f^{(2)}, \ldots, f^{(p)} \) exist and are continuous over interval \([a,b]\). We say \( f \) has modulus of continuity \( \omega \) (\( \omega : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+ \) is a nondecreasing function) if \( |f(x) - f(y)| \leq \omega(|x - y|) \) for any \( x \) and \( y \).

**Theorem 5** [53] If \( f \in C^p[-\pi, \pi] \) and \( f^{(p)} \) has modulus of continuity \( \omega \), then we have

\[
|f(x) - (S_N f)(x)| \leq O\left(\frac{\ln N}{N^p} \omega\left(\frac{2\pi}{N}\right)\right).
\]

We say \( f \) satisfies the \( \alpha \)-Hölder condition if \( |f(x) - f(y)| \leq C|x - y|^\alpha \), for some constant \( C \) and \( \alpha > 0 \) and any \( x \) and \( y \). The constant \( C \) is also called the Hölder coefficient of \( f \), also denoted as \( |f|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \).

**Example 4** It is easy to check that the utility function \( \mu \) in Example 3 satisfies 1-Hölder condition with coefficient 1 since \( |\frac{\partial \mu(x)}{\partial x}| \leq 1 \) for \( x \geq 0 \). We can also see that (1) satisfies 1-Hölder condition with coefficient \( \frac{1}{5} \).

For later development, we need a few simple lemmas. The proofs of these lemmas are straightforward and thus omitted here.

**Lemma 4** Suppose \( f : [a,c] \to \mathbb{R} \) is a continuous function which consists of two pieces \( f_1 : [a,b] \to \mathbb{R} \) and \( f_2 : [b,c] \to \mathbb{R} \). If both \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) satisfy the \( \alpha \)-Hölder condition with Hölder coefficient \( C \), then \( |f|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \leq 2C \).

**Lemma 5** Suppose \( f : [a,c] \to \mathbb{R} \) is a continuous function satisfying the \( \alpha \)-Hölder condition with Hölder coefficient \( C \). Then, for \( g(x) = f(hx) \) for some constant \( h \), we have \( |g|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \leq Ch^\alpha \).

**Corollary 1** If \( f \in C^0[-hT_\epsilon, hT_\epsilon] \) satisfies the \( \alpha \)-Hölder condition, it holds that

\[
|f(x) - (S_N f)(x)| \leq O\left(\frac{|f|_{C^{0,\alpha}} \ln N}{N^\alpha} \left(\frac{hT_\epsilon}{\pi}\right)^\alpha\right)
\]
Proof: By taking $p = 0$ and $\omega(x) = |f|_{C^{0, \alpha}} x^\alpha$ in Theorem 5, we can see that if $f \in C^0[-\pi, \pi]$ satisfies the $\alpha$-Hölder condition then

$$|f(x) - (S_N f)(x)| \leq O\left(\frac{|f|_{C^{0, \alpha}} \ln N}{N^\alpha}\right).$$

Using Lemma 5, we obtain the corollary. Hence, assuming $|f|_{C^{0, \alpha}} = O(1)$ and letting

$$N = O\left(hT_\epsilon \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)^{1/\alpha}\right),$$

we obtain $|f(x) - (S_N f)(x)| \leq \epsilon$ for $x \in [-hT_\epsilon, hT_\epsilon]$. This also completes the proof of Theorem 2.

How to Choose $h$: Now, we discuss the issue left in Section 3.3, that is how to choose $h$ (the value should be independent of $c_i$s and $L$) to satisfy (4), when $\mu$ satisfies the $\alpha$-Hölder condition for some $\alpha > 1/2$.

We need the following results about the absolute convergence of Fourier coefficients. If $f$ satisfies the $\alpha$-Hölder condition for some $\alpha > 1/2$, then

$$\sum_{i=-\infty}^{+\infty} |c_i| \leq |f|_{C^{0, \alpha}} \cdot c_{\alpha}$$

where $c_{\alpha}$ only depends on $\alpha$ [53].

Suppose the original utility function $\mu$ satisfies the $\alpha$-Hölder condition with coefficient $C$, for some $\alpha > 1/2$. Now, we apply UTI-DECOMP to $\mu$. By Lemma 4, we know that the piecewise function $\mu$ satisfies $\alpha$-Hölder condition with coefficient $2C$. Therefore, we can easily see that $f(x) = \hat{\mu}(x)\eta^x$ satisfies $\alpha$-Hölder condition with coefficient at most $2^{1+2\alpha}C$ on $[-hT_\epsilon, hT_\epsilon]$ (This is because $\hat{\mu}$ is non-zero only in $[-2T_\epsilon, 2T_\epsilon]$). According to Lemma 5, we have

$$|f(x \cdot hT_\epsilon/2\pi)|_{C^{0, \alpha}} \leq 2^{1+2\alpha} \left(\frac{hT_\epsilon}{2\pi}\right)^\alpha C.$$

Therefore, by (4), it is sufficient to set value $h$ such that

$$hT_\epsilon \geq \log \frac{2^{1+2\alpha} \left(\frac{hT_\epsilon}{2\pi}\right)^\alpha C}{\epsilon} = 2T_\epsilon + O\left(\log(hT_\epsilon) + \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right).$$

We can easily verify that we can satisfy the above condition by $h = \max(2, O(\frac{1}{T_\epsilon \epsilon})).$

3.5 Applications

Now, let us see some applications of our general results to a few specific problems.

Top-$k$ Query with Set Interpretation: Imagine a top-$k$ query where we would like to return $k$ tuples with the smallest total weight (the order of these tuples does not matter). However, the weight of the tuples are uncertain. In this case, we can define the top-$k$ semantics under the expected utility maximization principle, that is to find the size-$k$ subset maximizing the expected utility, where the utility function is a function of the total weight of the subset. It is not hard to see that the exact version of the problem in the deterministic setting, that is to find a size-$k$ set of tuples with a given target weight, can be solved in pseudopolynomial time by dynamic programming. Thus, our result directly gives us a way to maximize the expected utility for a utility function satisfying the condition of Theorem 2.

Stochastic Shortest Path: We consider two utility functions $\chi(x)$ and $\bar{\chi}(x)$ considered in the introduction. Note that maximizing $E[\chi(\ell(Q))]$ is equivalent to maximizing $\Pr(\ell(Q) \leq 1)$. The following lemma is straightforward.
Lemma 6 For any solution $Q$,
\[
\Pr(\ell(Q) \leq 1) \leq \mathbb{E}[\overline{\ell}(Q)] \leq \Pr(\ell(Q) \leq 1 + \delta).
\]

By Theorem 1, Theorem 2 and Lemma 6, we can easily obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 2** Suppose there is a pseudopolynomial time algorithm for the exact version of $A$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, there is an algorithm that runs in time $(\frac{n}{\epsilon})^{O(\frac{1}{\epsilon} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})}$, and produces a solution $Q \in F$ such that
\[
\Pr(\ell(Q) \leq 1 + \delta) + \epsilon \geq \max_{Q' \in F} \Pr(\ell(Q') \leq 1 + \delta)
\]

**Proof:** We choose $T = 2$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. Thus $h = O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$ and $L = O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$.

The exact version of shortest path (we allow non-simple paths $^4$) can be solved in pseudopolynomial time by dynamic programming. Therefore, Corollary 2 generalizes several results for stochastic shortest path in [42, 41].

**Stochastic Knapsack:** Now, we briefly sketch how to apply the result to the stochastic knapsack problem. Recall in this problem, we are given a set $U$ of items with independent random sizes $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ and fixed profits $\{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ and an overflow probability $\gamma$. The goal is to find a subset $Q \subseteq U$ such that $\Pr(\sum_{i \in Q} x_i \geq 1) \leq \gamma$ and the total profit $v(Q) = \sum_{i \in Q} v_i$ is maximized.

We first make a guess of the optimal profit, rounded down to the nearest power of $(1 + \epsilon)$. There are at most $\log_{1+\epsilon} \frac{n \max \{v_i\}}{\min \{v_i\}}$ guesses. For each guess $O$, we solve the following problem. We discard all items with a profit larger than $O$. Let $\Delta = \frac{O}{n^2}$. For each item with a profit smaller than $\frac{O}{n}$, we set its new profit to be $\bar{v}_i = 0$. Then, we scale each of the rest profits $v_i$ to $\bar{v}_i = \Delta \left\lfloor \frac{v_i}{\Delta} \right\rfloor$. Now, we define the feasible set
\[
F(O) = \{ Q \mid \sum_{i \in Q} (1 - 2\epsilon)O \leq \sum_{i \in Q} \bar{v}_i \leq (1 + 2\epsilon)O \}.
\]

Since there are at most $\frac{n^2}{\epsilon}$ distinct $\bar{v}$ values, we can easily show that finding a solution $Q$ in $F(O)$ with a given total size can be solved in pseudopolynomial time by dynamic programming.

Denote the optimal solution by $Q^*$ and the optimal profit by $OPT$. Suppose $O$ is the right guess, i.e., $(\frac{1}{1+\epsilon})OPT \leq O \leq OPT$. We can easily see that for any solution $Q$, we have that
\[
(1 - \frac{1}{n}) \sum_{i \in Q} v_i - \epsilon O \leq \sum_{i \in Q} \bar{v}_i \leq \sum_{i \in Q} v_i
\]
where the first inequalities are due to $v_i \geq \frac{\epsilon O}{n}$ and we set at most $\epsilon O$ profit to zero. Therefore, we can see $Q^* \in F(O)$. Applying Corollary 2, we obtain a solution $Q$ such that
\[
\Pr(\ell(Q) \leq 1 + \delta) + \epsilon \geq \Pr(\ell(Q^*) \leq 1 + \delta).
\]

Moreover, the profit of this solution
\[
v(Q) = \sum_{i \in Q} v_i \geq \sum_{i \in Q} \bar{v}_i \geq (1 - 2\epsilon)O \geq (1 - O(\epsilon))OPT.
\]

Therefore, we have obtained the following corollary.

---

$^4$The exact version of shortest simple path is NP-hard, since it includes the Hamitonian path problem as a special case.
Corollary 3  For any fixed $\epsilon > 0$ and any constant $\gamma > 0$ there is a polynomial time algorithm to compute a set $Q$ of items such that the total profit $v(Q)$ is $1 - \epsilon$ factor of the optimum and $\Pr(\ell(Q) \leq 1 + \epsilon) \geq (1 - \epsilon)\gamma$.

Recently, Bhalgat et al. [11, Theorem 8.1] obtained the same result, with a running time $n^{O(1/\epsilon^2 \log 1/\epsilon)}$, while our running time is $(n^{1/\epsilon}O(1/\epsilon)\log 1/\epsilon) = n^{\text{poly}(1/\epsilon)}$.

3.6 Discussions

We discuss some possible extensions.

Convergence of Fourier series: The convergence of the Fourier series of a function is a classic topic in harmonic analysis. Whether the Fourier series converges to the given function and the rate of the convergence typically depends on a variety of smoothness condition of the function. We refer the readers to [53] for a more comprehensive treatment of this topic. We note that we could obtain a smoother $\hat{\mu}$ in the first step of UTI-DECOMP and use Theorem 5 to obtain a better bound for $L$. This would result in an even better running time. Our choice is simply for the ease of presentation.

Discontinuous utility functions: If the utility function $\mu$ is discontinuous, e.g., the threshold function, then the partial Fourier series behaves poorly around the discontinuous point, known as the Gibbs phenomenon. However, informally speaking, as the number of Fourier terms increases, the poorly-behaved strip around the edge becomes narrower. Therefore, if the majority of the probability mass of our solution lies outside the strip, we can still guarantee a good approximation of the expected utility. There are also techniques to reduce the effects of the Gibbs phenomenon to ensure the convergence rate of the Fourier expansion (See e.g., [25]). We leave the problem of dealing with discontinuous utility functions as an interesting open problem.

$\mu(x)$ is part of the input: So far, we have assumed that the utility function $\mu$ is a part of the problem but not a part of the particular input instance. Therefore, for any fixed $\epsilon$, $T_\epsilon$ is constant. Now let us consider the case when the utility function is specified as part of the input. In this case, as long as the scaled version of the function, i.e., $\mu(xT_\epsilon \pi)$, satisfies the required smooth condition, that is $O(1)$-Hölder continuous with a constant coefficient, our algorithm still carries through. To illustrate this point, we use an example.

Example 5 Consider the utility function

$$\mu(x) = \begin{cases} 
1 & x \in [0, \sqrt{n}] \\
-\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{\delta} + 1 & x \in [\sqrt{n}, (1 + \delta)\sqrt{n}] \\
0 & x > (1 + \delta)\sqrt{n}
\end{cases}$$

where $n$ is the number of vertices. The utility function depends on $n$, the size of the input instance. However, after scaling, we can see the function is equivalent to the utility function $\tilde{\chi}$ mentioned in the introduction. Thus, Theorem 2 is applicable. Let us consider another function

$$\mu(x) = \begin{cases} 
1 & x \in [0, \sqrt{n}] \\
-x + \sqrt{n} + 1 & x \in [\sqrt{n}, \sqrt{n} + 1] \\
0 & x > \sqrt{n} + 1
\end{cases}$$

Although the function satisfies 1-Hödel condition with coefficient 1, the scaled version $\mu(xT_\epsilon \pi)$ contains a steep piece whose slope depends on $\sqrt{n}$. Such a piece where the function value changes drastically resembles a discontinuous point and would cause the Gibbs phenomenon type of behavior for a Fourier expansion with only constant terms.
4 Element Uncertainty Model

In this section, we consider EWMP in the element uncertainty model. We first show that EWMP is NP-hard for shortest path and spanning tree. Then, we present a PTAS for it.

4.1 Complexity

The decision problem of EWMP asks whether there is a solution $Q$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\ell^P(Q)]$ is at most a given value $K$.

**Theorem 6** The decision version of EWMP is NPC for shortest path and minimum spanning tree.

**Proof:** We only prove the theorem for shortest path. Clearly, given a path $Q$, we can compute $\mathbb{E}[\ell^P(Q)]$ in polynomial time. Therefore, the problem is in NP. We prove the NP-hardness by reducing from the subset sum problem which is well known to be NP-complete [23]. An instance of the subset sum problem consists of $n$ integers, say $a_1, \ldots, a_n$, with $\sum a_i = 2W$. The question is whether there is a subset $S$ of integers such that $\sum_{i \in S} a_i = W$. We scale down every $a_i$ by a factor of $W$ and the question becomes to find, from a set of numbers which sum up to 2, a subset of numbers with summation exactly 1.

Given an instance, we construct a probabilistic graph as follows: There are $n + 1$ nodes, $v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_n$ and two parallel $e_i$ and $e'_i$ edges between $v_i$ and $v_{i+1}$ for each $i$. The length and probability of each edge are set up to be $p_{e_i} = 1, c_{e_i} = a_i$ and $p_{e'_i} = e^{-a_i}, c_{e_i} = 0$. We let the penalty $P = 2$. We prove that there is a $(v_0, v_n)$ path $Q$ with $\mathbb{E}[\ell^P(Q)] = 2 - 1/e$ if and only if there is a subset $S$ of integers such that $\sum_{i \in S} a_i = 1$.

Let us first suppose there is such a subset $S$. We construct a $(v_0, v_n)$ path $Q$ that use $e_i$ if $a_i \in S$ and $e'_i$ otherwise. It is easy to see

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell^P(Q)] = 2 + \prod_{i \notin S} e^{-a_i}(\sum_{i \in S} a_i - 2) = 2 - \frac{1}{e}. $$

Now, we show the other direction. Suppose path $Q$ has $\mathbb{E}[\ell^P(Q)] = 2 - 1/e$. Let $S = \{i | e'_i \in Q\}$. Write $x = \sum_{S} a_i$. We can see

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell^P(Q)] = 2 + e^{x-2}(x-2).$$

By elementary calculus, it can be shown the function

$$f(x) = 2 + e^{x-2}(x-2) \geq 2 - 1/e$$

for $0 \leq x \leq 2$ where the equality holds only when $x = 1$. The same proof shows the EWMP version of minimum spanning tree is NP-hard. \hfill \square

4.2 A PTAS

In this subsection, we present PTASs for the EWMP versions of several combinatorial problems.

We consider the set of incidence vectors of feasible solutions, i.e., $\{x \in \{0, 1\}^m : x$ is the incidence vector of some $Q \in F\}$. We project those points to a 2-d plane spanned by two vectors $(c_e)_{e \in E}$ and $(\ln p_e)_{e \in E}$. We can see that the projection of $x = (x_e)_{e \in E} \in \{0, 1\}^m$ is $(\sum_{e \in E} x_e c_e, \sum_{e \in E} x_e \ln p_e)$. Let the set of points in the 2-d plane be $\mathcal{P}$ the convex hull of those points be $\mathcal{H}$. We can show that our problem is equivalent to find a point $(y, z)$ in $\mathcal{P}$ such that

$$f(y, z) = e^z \cdot y + (1 - e^z)P$$
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Figure 1: \( f(x, y) = e^y \cdot x + (1 - e^y) \). The right hand side is the level sets of \( f \).

is minimized. Indeed, this can be easily seen as follows:

\[
\exp\left(\sum_{e \in E} x_e \ln p_e\right) \cdot \sum_{e \in E} x_e c_e + \left(1 - \exp\left(\sum_{e \in E} x_e \ln p_e\right)\right) P
\]

\[
= \prod_{x_e = 1} P e \sum_{x_e = 1} c_e + \left(1 - \prod_{x_e = 1} p_e\right) P.
\]

Let consider the problem of minimizing \( f(y, z) \) over \( \mathcal{H} \). It is easy to see \( f(y, z) \) on the entire plane (i.e., \( y \)-\( z \) plane) is neither convex nor a concave. See Figure 1. However, a slight calculation shows that \( f(y, z) \) is concave for \( 0 \leq y \leq P \) and \( z \leq 0 \) and convex for \( y > P \) and \( z \leq 0 \). Therefore, if \( \mathcal{H} \) lies entirely on \([P, +\infty) \times [0, \infty]\) (this can be determined by solving a deterministic minimization problem with element weight being \( c_e \)), then the optimal solution must be a vertex. Moreover, minimizing a convex function over a polytope can be formulated as a convex program which can be solved in polynomial time, provided that the objective is differentiable or there is a polynomial time separation oracle [26].

Now, we assume \( \mathcal{H} \) does not lie entirely in \([P, +\infty) \times [0, \infty]\). It is not hard to see that \( f(y, z) \leq P \) for all \( y < P \) and \( f(y', z) \geq P \) for all \( y > P \). Therefore, the optimal solution must be in \([0, P] \times [0, \infty]\). We need the notion of \( \epsilon \)-approximate Pareto curve [44]. We are given a multi-objective minimization problem with \( h \) objectives \( f_1, \ldots, f_h \) and a parameter \( \epsilon > 0 \). A \( \epsilon \)-Pareto curve for the problem, denoted by \( P_\epsilon \), is a set of solutions \( x \) with the following property: For any solution \( x' \), there is some \( x \in P_\epsilon \) such that \( f_i(x) < (1 + \epsilon) f_i(x') \) \( \forall 1 \leq i \leq h \). Now, we present the main theorem in this section.

**Theorem 7** Suppose an \( \epsilon \)-approximate Pareto curve \( P_\epsilon \) for problem \( A \) is given. Then, we can compute an \((1 + \epsilon)\)-approximation for \( \text{EWMP}(A) \) in \(|P_\epsilon|\) time.

**Proof:** By the previous argument, we can assume without loss of generality that \( \mathcal{H} \not\subset [P, +\infty) \times [0, \infty] \). Suppose the optimal solution is \( Q^* \). For any solution \( Q \), let \( y(Q) = \sum_{e \in Q} c_e \) and \( z(Q) = -\sum_{e \in Q} \ln p_e \). The assumption implies that \( y(Q^*) \leq P \). We first consider the case that \( y(Q^*) \leq \frac{P}{1 + \epsilon} \). In this case, we compute \( \mathbb{E}[\ell^P(Q)] \) for each solution \( Q \in P_\epsilon \) and then choose the smallest one to be our final solution. By the definition of \( \epsilon \)-approximate Pareto curve, we know there is solution \( Q \in P_\epsilon \) such that \( y(Q) \leq (1 + \epsilon) y(Q^*) \)
and $z(Q) \leq (1 + \epsilon)z(Q^*)$. Thus, we have $y(Q) \leq P$. We can see that

$$
\mathbb{E}[\ell^P(Q^*)] = f(y(Q), z(Q)) = e^{-z(Q)}(y(Q) - P) + P \\
\leq e^{-(1+\epsilon)z(Q^*)}(1 + \epsilon)y(Q^*) - P) + P \\
\leq e^{-z(Q^*)}(1 + \epsilon)y(Q^*) + P(1 - e^{-(1+\epsilon)z(Q^*)}) \\
\leq (1 + \epsilon)e^{-z(Q*)}y(Q^*) + (1 + \epsilon)P(1 - e^{-z(Q^*)}) \\
= (1 + \epsilon)f(y(Q^*), z(Q^*)).
$$

where the third inequality follows from the fact that

$$1 - e^{-(1+\epsilon)z(Q^*)} \leq 1 - e^{-z(Q^*)} + \epsilon z(Q^*)e^{-z(Q^*)} \leq 1 - e^{-z(Q^*)} + \epsilon(1 - e^{-z(Q^*)})$$

The first inequality holds since $e^{-x} \geq 1 - x$ and the last inequality holds since $e^{-x}(x + 1) \leq 1$ for all $x \geq 0$. Now we consider the case that $\frac{P}{1 + \epsilon} \leq y(Q^*) \leq P$. This case is even simpler. We claim that for any solution $Q$ such that $y(Q) \leq P$ is a good solution. This is because

$$
\mathbb{E}[\ell^P(Q^*)] = e^{-z(Q^*)}(y(Q^*) - P) + P \geq (y(Q^*) - P) + P = y(Q^*)
$$

$$
\geq \frac{P}{1 + \epsilon} \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\ell^P(Q)]}{1 + \epsilon}
$$

We have shown that in either case we can find a solution $Q$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\ell^P(Q)] \leq (1 + \epsilon)\mathbb{E}[\ell^P(Q^*)]$. \hfill \box

The following theorem, proved in [44], is important to us.

**Theorem 8** [44] For any multi-objective optimization problem with constant number of objectives and any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\epsilon$-approximate Pareto curve consisting of a polynomial number of solutions. Moreover, there is an FPTAS for constructing an $\epsilon$-approximate Pareto curve if there is a pseudopolynomial algorithm for the exact version of the problem.

**Corollary 4** There are FPTAS’s for the EWMP versions of shortest path, minimum spanning tree and matching.

**Proof:** The exact version of shortest path (we allow non-simple paths) can be solved in pseudopolynomial time by dynamic programming. The exact version of minimum spanning tree and matching were solved in [4] and [38], respectively. The corollary follows easily from Theorem 8 and 7. \hfill \box

In fact, it is known that for any matroid that can be represented in vector space, there is a randomized pseudopolynomial time algorithm for finding a base of a specific weight [12]. However, for general matroid, the problem is still open. Therefore, Theorem 8 is not applicable. However, we can easily obtain an $\epsilon$-approximate Pareto curve for matroid base problem using a different scheme.

**Corollary 5** There is an FPTAS for the EWMP version of the matroid base problem.

**Proof:** By Theorem 7, it suffices to show that we can obtain an $\epsilon$-approximate Pareto curve in polynomial time. For this purpose, we use the result for bicriteria matroid base problem by Ravi et al. [47]. The problem is defined as follows: Each element $e$ has a length $l_e$ and weight $w_e$. We are also given a weight constraint

\footnote{The exact version of shortest simple path is NP-hard, since it includes the Hamiltonian path problem as a special case.}
The goal is to find a base $B$ of the matroid such that $\sum_{e \in B} w_e \leq W$ and $\sum_{e \in B} l_e$ is minimized. Ravi et al. show that there is a PTAS for this problem. Now, we show that we can easily construct an $\epsilon$-approximate Pareto curve using this result. Let $w_{\min} = \min_e (-\ln p_e)$ and $w_{\max} = n \max_e (-\ln p_e)$. Let $W_i = w_{\min} (1 + \epsilon)^i$ for $1 \leq i \leq \log_{1+\epsilon} \frac{w_{\max}}{w_{\min}}$. For each such weight constraint $W_i$, we compute a $(1 + \epsilon)$-approximate solution $Q_i$. It is not hard to see that $\{Q_i\}_i$ is a polynomial size $\epsilon$-approximate Pareto curve.

**Smoothed Complexity:** A series of recent papers [6, 48, 37] have established that, in the smoothed analysis framework, the size of the Pareto curve is polynomial in $n$ for a large class of problems with constant number of linear objectives. Moreover, computing the Pareto curve can also be done in expected polynomial time in smoothed analysis framework if the single objective version is solvable in randomized pseudopolynomial time. Since the optimal solution is always a point in the Pareto curve, we can conclude $\text{EWMP}(A)$ can be solved in expected polynomial time in the smoothed analysis framework if $A$ is solvable in randomized pseudopolynomial time.

## 5 Conclusion

We consider the problem of maximizing expected utility for many stochastic combinatorial problems, such as shortest path, spanning tree and matching. We develop a polynomial time approximation scheme with additive error $\epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. A key ingredient in our algorithm is to decompose the utility function into a short exponential sum. In this paper, we use the Fourier series technique to fulfill this task. Exploring other approaches is an interesting future work. Our general approximation framework may be useful for other stochastic optimization problems. One major open problem left is to obtain approximations with reasonable multiplicative factors, or even a PTAS, for the utility maximization problem. Resolving this problem is of great interest even for some special utility functions, such as the threshold function, $1/(1 + x)^a$ and so on.

## 6 Acknowledgment

We would like to thank Evdokia Nikolova for providing an extended version of [42] and many helpful discussions. We also would like thank Chandra Chekuri for pointing us the recent work [11].

## References


