Approximation of Dense-$\frac{n}{2}$-Subgraph and the Complement of Min-Bisection *

Yinyu Ye and Jiawei Zhang

November 1999 (Modified December 1999)

Abstract

We consider the DENSE-$\frac{n}{2}$-SUBGRAPH problem, i.e., determine a block of half number nodes from a weighted graph such that the sum of the edge weights, within the subgraph induced by the block, is maximized. We prove that a strengthened semidefinite relaxation with a mixed rounding technique yields a .586 approximations of the problem. The previous best-known results for approximating this problem are .25 using a simple coin-toss randomization, .48 using a semidefinite relaxation, .5 using a linear programming relaxation or another semidefinite relaxation. In fact, a un-strengthened SDP relaxation provably yields no more than .5 approximation. We also consider the complement of the graph MIN-BISECTION problem, i.e., partitioning the nodes into two blocks of equal cardinality so as to maximize the weights of non-crossing edges. We present a .602 approximation of the complement of MIN-BISECTION.

Key words. Min-bisection, dense-k-subgraph, polynomial approximation algorithm, semidefinite programming.

*Department of Management Sciences, Henry B. Tippie College of Business, The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242. Research supported in part by NSF grants DMI-9908077 and DMS-9703490.

1 Introduction

Given a undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and non-negative weights $w_{ij} = w_{ji}$ on the edges $(i, j) \in E$, the b-balanced min-cut problem is that of finding a subset of nodes or vertices $S \subset V$ to minimize

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j)\in E, i\in S, j\in V\setminus S} w_{ij}$$

such that $bn \leq |S| \leq (1-b)n$, where $n = |V|$ and $b \leq \frac{1}{2}$. The special case in which $b = \frac{1}{2}$ is sometimes referred to as the graph MIN-BISECTION problem [15]. The problem can be formulated as follows:

$$\text{(GBP)} \qquad \begin{array}{rll} w_* := & \text{Minimize} & \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i<j} w_{ij}(1 - x_i x_j) \\ & \text{subject to} & \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad e^T x = 0 \\ & & x_j^2 = 1, \ j = 1, \ldots, n, \end{array}$$

where $e \in R^n$ is the column vector of all ones, superscript ^{T} is the transpose operator.

(GBP) is a foundermental problem in the area of combinatorial optimization. It arises from many network applications such as circuit partition [2]. In particular, it is used as a subroutine in designing approximation algorithm for a class of combinatorial optimization problems, via a divide-and-conquer approach, see Leighton and Rao [11] and Shmoys [15].

So far, the best result for (GBP) in the literature is due to Leighton and Rao [10]. They show that there exists a polynomial algorithm for finding a b-balanced cut with $b = \frac{1}{3}$ of value $O(\log n) \cdot w_*$, where w_* is the minimal value of the (GBP). Even et.al. [3] get the similar result by using an alternative approach. Note that these are not true approximation algorithms for (GBP) [17], since $b \neq \frac{1}{2}$. For the planar graph, there exists a 2-approximation algorithm due to Garg et.al. [7].

Many heuristic methods have been proposed in the literature. In a recent note [2], Choi and Ye carried out some computational study of using a semidefinite programming (SDP) relaxation to approximate the Circuit Bisection problem. They essentially modeled the Circuit Bisection problem as a (GBP), and then used a SDP relaxation based method to solve the problem. Their computational results showed that the SDP approach worked better than other known heuristics, especially when circuits are large.

The SDP relaxation, originally proposed by Lovasz and Shrijver [12], has been successfully applied to various graph optimization problem. Goemans and Williamson [9] presented an .878-approximation algorithm for the MAX-CUT problem. Feige and Goemans [4] refined this approach by adding additional constraints to the semidefinite program and lead to an improved .859-approximation algorithm for the MAX-DICUT problem. Frieze and Jerrum [6] obtained polynomial approximation algorithms for MAX-K-CUT and MAX-BISECTION, and both of them have a better performance guarantee than earlier results. Nesterov [14], Zwick [20], and Ye [19] extended the SDP method to solving more general problems. Using more complicated rounding and proving techniques, Ye [18] made an improvement in the performance guarantee from .651 of Frieze and Jerrum [6] to .699 for MAX-BISECTION. (See Mahajan and Ramesh [13] for some de-randomization techniques for SDP.)

Using the same techniques, we now present a .602 approximation for the complement of (GBP), that is,

$$
\text{(CGBP)} \qquad \begin{aligned} w^* := \quad & \text{Maximize} && \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i<j} w_{ij}(1 + x_i x_j) \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad e^T x = 0 \\ &&& x_j^2 = 1, \; j = 1, \ldots, n. \end{aligned}
$$

Note that for the same graph, the sum of w_* and w^* is the sum of the total edge weights of the graph:

$$
w^* + w_* = \sum_{i<j} w_{ij}.
$$

A closely related problem to (CGBP) is the so-called DENSE-k-SUBGRAPH problem (DSP), i.e. determine a subset $S \subset V$ of k nodes such that the total weight of the subgraph induced by S is maximized, see [16]. This problem can be formulated as:

$$
\text{(DSP)} \qquad \begin{aligned} w^* := \quad & \text{Maximize} && \frac{1}{4}\sum_{i<j} w_{ij}(1 + x_i + x_j + x_i x_j) \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_j = 2k - n \quad \text{or} \quad e^T x = 2k - n \\ &&& x_j^2 = 1, \; j = 1, \ldots, n, \end{aligned}
$$

In this paper, we consider the case of $k = n/2$.

The previous best-known results for this problem are .25 using a simple coin-toss randomization technique, .5 using a linear programming relaxation (Goemans [8]) or a SDP relaxation (Feige and Seltser [5]), and .48 using a different SDP relaxation (Srivastav and Wolf [16]). In fact, Srivastav and Wolf have proved that the SDP relaxation used in their analysis yields at most .5 approximation of DENSE-$\frac{n}{2}$-SUBGRAPH. Crossing the .5 barrier, we present in this paper a .586 strengthened SDP-based approximation algorithm, following a .519 approximation algorithm, for the DENSE-$\frac{n}{2}$-SUBGRAPH problem.

2 SDP Relaxation and Approximation of (CGBP)

Our semidefinite programming relaxation of (CGBP) is:

$$\text{(SDP)} \qquad \begin{array}{rll} w_{SD} := & \text{Maximize} & \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i<j} w_{ij}(1+X_{ij}) \\ & \text{subject to} & \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n X_{ij} = 0 \quad (\text{or} \quad ee^T \bullet X = 0), \\ & & X_{jj} = 1, \quad j = 1, ..., n, \ X \succeq 0. \end{array} \tag{1}$$

Here, $e \in R^n$ is the vector of all ones and the unknown $X \in R^{n \times n}$ is a symmetric matrix. Furthermore, $\bullet$ is the matrix inner product $Q \bullet X = \text{trace}(Q^T X)$, and $X \succeq Z$ means that $X - Z$ is positive semidefinite.

Obviously, (SDP) is a relaxation of (CGBP), since for any feasible solution x of (CGBP), $X = xx^T$ is feasible for (SDP); so that $w_{SD} \geq w^*$.

Before present our results, let us introduce some notations. Let $\bar{X}$ be an optimal solution of (SDP). For a given $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$, let

$$\alpha(\theta) = \min_{-1<y\leq 1} \frac{1 + \frac{2}{\pi}\arcsin(\theta y)}{1+y}, \tag{2}$$

$$\beta(\theta) = 1 - \frac{2}{\pi}\arcsin(\theta) - \frac{1 - \frac{2}{\pi}\arcsin(\theta)}{n} + \min_{-1\leq y<1} \frac{2}{\pi}\frac{\arcsin(\theta) - \arcsin(\theta y)}{1-y}, \tag{3}$$

and let θ^* and R^* be the optimizer and optimal value, respectively, to the following:

$$\max_{0\leq\theta\leq 1} R(\theta) := \frac{\alpha(\theta)}{\beta(\theta)^2}\left(1 - \sqrt{1-\beta(\theta)}\right)^2.$$

Then, let $\alpha := \alpha(\theta^*)$ and $\beta := \beta(\theta^*)$.

The following approximation method is similar to the one in Frieze and Jerrum [6], Srivastav and Wolf [16], and Ye [18], also see Nesterov [14] and Zwick [20].

1. SDP Solving: Solve (SDP) to obtain a semidefinite matrix $\bar{X}$.

Repeat the following two steps for $[\epsilon^{-1}\log\epsilon^{-1}]$ times, where $\epsilon > 0$ is small constant as stated in Frieze and Jerrum [6], and output the best bisection.

2. Randomized Rounding: Generate a vector u from a multivariate normal distribution with 0 mean and covariance matrix $\theta^*\bar{X} + (1-\theta^*)I$, where I is the identity matrix. That is, generate

$$u \in N(0, \theta^*\bar{X} + (1-\theta^*)I),$$

then assign

$$\hat{x} = \mathrm{sign}(u),$$

i.e.,

$$\hat{x}_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } u_i \geq 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } u_i < 0. \end{cases}.$$

Select the block $S = \{i : \hat{x}_i = 1\}$ or $S = \{i : \hat{x}_i = -1\}$ such that $|S| \geq n/2$. Let $\tilde{S} = S$.

3. Node Swapping: For each $i \in \tilde{S}$, let $\zeta(i) = \sum_{j\in\tilde{S}} w_{ij}$ and $\tilde{S} := \{i_1, i_2, ..., i_{|\tilde{S}|}\}$, where $\zeta(i_1) \geq \zeta(i_2) \geq ... \geq \zeta(i_{|\tilde{S}|})$. Then, remove node $i_{|\tilde{S}|}$ from $\tilde{S}$ and reassign $\tilde{S} := \{i_1, i_2, ..., i_{|\tilde{S}|-1}\}$. Repeat this swapping process till $|\tilde{S}| = n/2$. ■

For any $U \subset V$, denote the total weights within the subgraph induced by U as $w(U)$, that is,

$$w(U) := \sum_{i<j,\ i\in U,\ j\in U} w_{ij},$$

define

$$w(U, V\setminus U) = w(U) + w(V\setminus U).$$

Then, the following lemma holds and is due to Srivastav and Wolf [16]:

Lemma 1 *The total weights of non-crossing edges*

$$w(\tilde{S}, V\setminus\tilde{S}) \geq \frac{\frac{n}{2}(\frac{n}{2}-1)}{|S|(|S|-1)} \cdot w(S, V\setminus S). \tag{4}$$

Proof. The edge disappears in the swapping procedure if and only if one of its endpoints is removed. It follows that

$$\sum_{i\in\tilde{S}} w(\tilde{S}\setminus\{i\}) = (|\tilde{S}|-2)w(\tilde{S}),$$

since each edge is counted $|\tilde{S}|-2$ times. Suppose v is the node that is removed in the swapping procedure, then

$$\sum_{j\in\tilde{S}} w_{vj} \le \sum_{j\in\tilde{S}} w_{ij} \qquad \text{for any other } \ i\in\tilde{S}.$$

Thus,

$$w(\tilde{S}\setminus\{v\}) \ge \frac{1}{|\tilde{S}|}\sum_{i\in\tilde{S}} w(\tilde{S}\setminus\{i\}) = \frac{|\tilde{S}|-2}{|\tilde{S}|}\cdot w(\tilde{S}).$$

By induction we get that the final $\tilde{S}$ satisfies

$$w(\tilde{S}) \ge \frac{\frac{n}{2}(\frac{n}{2}-1)}{|S|(|S|-1)}\cdot w(S).$$

Therefore,

$$w(\tilde{S},V\backslash\tilde{S}) = w(\tilde{S})+w(V\backslash\tilde{S}) \ge \frac{\frac{n}{2}(\frac{n}{2}-1)}{|S|(|S|-1)}\cdot w(S)+w(V\backslash S) \ge \frac{\frac{n}{2}(\frac{n}{2}-1)}{|S|(|S|-1)}\cdot w(S,V\backslash S).$$

■

3 Analysis of the Approximation of (CGBP)

In order to analyze the quality of bisection $\tilde{S}$, we define two random variables similar to those in [6, 18]:

$$w := w(S,V\setminus S) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i<j} w_{ij}(1+\hat{x}_i\hat{x}_j) = \frac{1}{4}\sum_{i,j} w_{ij}(1+\hat{x}_i\hat{x}_j)$$

and

$$m := |S|(n-|S|) = \frac{n^2}{4} - \frac{(e^T\hat{x})^2}{4} = \frac{1}{4}\sum_{i,j}(1-\hat{x}_i\hat{x}_j).$$

Lemma 2 *Our approximation method yields S satisfying the following two inequalities:*

$$E[w] \geq \alpha \cdot w_{SD} \geq \alpha \cdot w^*,$$

$$E[m] \geq \beta \cdot \frac{n^2}{4}.$$

Proof. From Goemans and Williamson [9], Frieze and Jerrum [6], and Bertsimas and Ye [1], we have

$$\mathrm{E}[\hat{x}_i \hat{x}_j] = \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\theta^* \bar{X}_{ij}), \quad i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n. \tag{5}$$

Using the same argument in Ye [18] and by the definition of α from (2), we get

$$1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\theta^* \bar{X}_{ij}) \geq \alpha(1 + \bar{X}_{ij}).$$

Thus

$$\mathrm{E}[w] = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i,j} w_{ij} \left(1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\theta^* \bar{X}_{ij})\right) \geq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i,j} w_{ij} \cdot \alpha(1 + \bar{X}_{ij}) = \alpha \cdot w_{SD}. \tag{6}$$

Let

$$\alpha' = \min_{-1 \leq y < 1} \frac{2}{\pi} \cdot \frac{\arcsin(\theta^*) - \arcsin(\theta^* y)}{1 - y}$$

and noting that

$$\sum_{i \neq j} \bar{X}_{ij} = -n,$$

we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
n^2 - \mathrm{E}[(e^T \hat{x})^2] &= \sum_{i \neq j} \left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\theta^* \bar{X}_{ij})\right) \\
&\geq \sum_{i \neq j} \left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\theta^*) + \alpha'(1 - \bar{X}_{ij})\right) \\
&= (n^2 - n) \left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\theta^*)\right) + (n^2 - n)\alpha' + n\alpha' \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\theta^*) + \alpha'\right) \cdot n^2 - \left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\theta^*)\right) \cdot n \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\theta^*) + \alpha' - \frac{1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin(\theta^*)}{n}\right) \cdot n^2 \\
&= \beta \cdot n^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the second desired result in the lemma is obtained by the definition of m. ■

Consider a new random variable

$$z(\gamma) := \frac{w}{w^*} + \gamma \frac{4m}{n^2}, \tag{7}$$

where

$$\gamma = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\beta}} - 1). \tag{8}$$

By lemma 2, we have

$$\mathrm{E}[z(\gamma)] \geq \alpha + \gamma\beta \quad \text{and} \quad z \leq 1 + \gamma.$$

Now we prove another lemma:

Lemma 3 *If random variable $z(\gamma)$ fulfills its expectation, i.e., $z(\gamma) \geq \alpha + \gamma\beta$, then*

$$w(\tilde{S}, V \setminus \tilde{S}) \geq \frac{n-2}{n-1} \cdot R^* \cdot w^*,$$

where recall that

$$R^* = \frac{\alpha}{\beta^2}\left(1 - \sqrt{1-\beta}\right)^2.$$

Proof. Suppose

$$w(S, V \setminus S) = \lambda w^* \quad \text{and} \quad |S| = \delta n \geq n/2,$$

which from (7) and $z(\gamma) \geq \alpha + \gamma\beta$ implies that

$$\lambda \geq \alpha + \gamma\beta - 4\gamma\delta(1-\delta).$$

Applying (4), $1/2 \leq \delta \leq 1$, and (8), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} w(\tilde{S}, V \setminus \tilde{S}) &\geq \frac{\frac{n}{2}(\frac{n}{2}-1)}{\delta n(\delta n - 1)} w(S, V \setminus S) \\ &\geq \frac{n-2}{n-\frac{1}{\delta}} \cdot \frac{1}{4\delta^2} \cdot w(S, V \setminus S) \\ &\geq \frac{n-2}{n-1} \cdot \frac{1}{4\delta^2} \cdot w(S, V \setminus S) \\ &= \frac{n-2}{n-1} \cdot \frac{\lambda}{4\delta^2} \cdot w^* \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\geq \frac{n-2}{n-1} \cdot \frac{\alpha + \gamma\beta - 4\gamma\delta(1-\delta)}{4\delta^2} \cdot w^* \\
&\geq \frac{n-2}{n-1} \cdot \frac{\alpha\gamma + (\beta-1)\gamma^2}{\alpha + \gamma\beta} \cdot w^* \\
&= \frac{n-2}{n-1} \cdot \frac{\alpha}{\beta^2}\left(1 - \sqrt{1-\beta}\right)^2 \cdot w^* \\
&= \frac{n-2}{n-1} \cdot R^* \cdot w^*.
\end{aligned}
$$

The last inequality follows from simple calculus that

$$\delta = \frac{\alpha + \beta\gamma}{2\gamma}$$

yields the minimal value for

$$\frac{\alpha + \gamma\beta - 4\gamma\delta(1-\delta)}{4\delta^2}$$

in the interval $[1/2, 1]$. ■

Now we are ready to give the first main result of this paper.

Theorem 1 *The worst case performance ratio of the approximation method for the complement of MIN-BISECTION is at least 0.602 as n sufficiently large.*

Proof. For n sufficiently large, we verified that for $\theta = .78$, $\alpha(\theta) \geq .7848$ and $\beta(\theta) \geq .9800$, therefore,

$$R^* \geq R(\theta) = \frac{\alpha(\theta)}{\beta(\theta)^2}\left(1 - \sqrt{1-\beta(\theta)}\right)^2 \geq .6024;$$

for $\theta = .73$, $\alpha(\theta) \geq .7604$ and $\beta(\theta) \geq .9848$, therefore,

$$R^* \geq R(\theta) = \frac{\alpha(\theta)}{\beta(\theta)^2}\left(1 - \sqrt{1-\beta(\theta)}\right)^2 \geq .6028.$$

Thus, for n sufficiently large, we must have

$$\frac{n-2}{n-1} \cdot R^* \geq .602.$$

Following the rest of proof of Frieze and Jerrum [6], we have proved the theorem. ■

4 SDP Relaxation and Approximation of (DSP)

Our SDP relaxation of (DSP) is

$$
\text{(DSDP)} \qquad
\begin{array}{rll}
w_{SD} := & \text{Maximize} & \frac{1}{4}\sum_{0<i<j} w_{ij}(1 + X_{0i} + X_{0j} + X_{ij}) \\
& \text{subject to} & \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} X_{ij} = 0 \quad (\text{or} \quad (0;e)(0;e)^T \bullet X = 0), \\
& & X_{jj} = 1, \quad j = 0, ..., n, \ X \succeq 0.
\end{array}
\qquad (9)
$$

Here, the unknown $X \in R^{(n+1)\times(n+1)}$, row and column indexed from 0 to n.

The rounding algorithm for (DSP) is similar to Srivastav and Wolf [16]:

1. SDP Solving: Solve the problem (DSDP) to obtain a semidefinite matrix $\bar{X}$.

Repeat the following two steps for $[\epsilon^{-1}\log\epsilon^{-1}]$ times, where $\epsilon > 0$ is small constant as stated in Frieze and Jerrum [6], and output the best subgraph.

2. Randomized Rounding: Generate a vector

$$u \in N(0, \theta^*\bar{X} + (1-\theta^*)I).$$

Then assign

$$\hat{x} = \text{sign}(u).$$

Select the block $S = \{i > 0 : \hat{x}_i = \hat{x}_0\}$. Let $\tilde{S} = S$.

3. Node Swapping:

• If $|\tilde{S}| > n/2$, then for each $i \in \tilde{S}$, let $\zeta(i) = \sum_{j\in\tilde{S}} w_{ij}$ and $\tilde{S} := \{i_1, i_2, ..., i_{|\tilde{S}|}\}$, where $\zeta(i_1) \geq \zeta(i_2) \geq ... \geq \zeta(i_{|\tilde{S}|})$. Then, remove node $i_{|\tilde{S}|}$ from $\tilde{S}$ and reassign $\tilde{S} := \{i_1, i_2, ..., i_{|\tilde{S}|-1}\}$. Repeat this swapping process till $|\tilde{S}| = n/2$.

• If $|\tilde{S}| \leq n/2$, arbitrarily add $n/2 - |\tilde{S}|$ nodes from outside of $\tilde{S}$ into $\tilde{S}$. ■

The following lemma is the analogue of Lemma 1.

Lemma 4 *The total weights of edges in the subgraph induced by $\tilde{S}$*

$$w(\tilde{S}) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{\frac{n}{2}(\frac{n}{2}-1)}{|S|(|S|-1)} w(S) & \text{if } |S| > n/2 \\ w(S) & \text{if } |S| \leq n/2 \end{cases}. \qquad (10)$$

5 Analysis of the Approximation of (DSP)

In order to analyze the quality of subgraph $\tilde{S}$, we again consider two random variables:

$$w := w(S) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{0<i<j} w_{ij}(1 + \hat{x}_0\hat{x}_i + \hat{x}_0\hat{x}_j + \hat{x}_i\hat{x}_j)$$

$$m := |S|(n - |S|) = \frac{n^2}{4} - \frac{(e^T\hat{x})^2}{4} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i>0,j>0} (1 - \hat{x}_i\hat{x}_j).$$

The rest analysis is parallel to that of CGBP with one exception: while $\beta(\theta)$, $R(\theta)$, etc. remain the same as before, $\alpha(\theta)$ needs to be re-defined.

For any given $0 < \theta < 1$, let us generate a vector $u \in N(0, \theta\bar{X} + (1-\theta)I)$, assign $\hat{x} = \text{sign}(u)$, and select the block $S(\theta) = \{i : \hat{x}_i = \hat{x}_0\}$. Then, we have

$$\mathrm{E}[w(S(\theta))] = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{0<i<j} w_{ij} \left(1 + \frac{2}{\pi}\left(\arcsin(\theta\bar{X}_{0i}) + \arcsin(\theta\bar{X}_{0j}) + \arcsin(\theta\bar{X}_{ij})\right)\right) \tag{11}$$

Note that $\bar{X}_{0i}$, $\bar{X}_{0j}$ and $\bar{X}_{ij}$ are three off-diagonal components of a 3×3 positive semidefinite matrix whose diagonal components are all ones.

Denote by

$$a = \bar{X}_{0i}, \quad b = \bar{X}_{0j}, \quad \text{and} \quad c = \bar{X}_{ij}.$$

The following lemma is a generalization of a result in Goemans and Williamson [9].

Lemma 5 *For any* $0 < \theta \leq 1$,

$$1 + \frac{2}{\pi}\left(\arcsin(\theta a) + \arcsin(\theta b) + \arcsin(\theta c)\right) \geq \alpha(\theta)(1 + a + b + c)$$

for all

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & a & b \\ a & 1 & c \\ b & c & 1 \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0,$$

where

$$\alpha(\theta) = \min_{-1/3<y\leq 1} \frac{1 + \frac{6}{\pi}\arcsin(\theta y)}{1 + 3y}. \tag{12}$$

Proof. Consider the minimization problem of

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Minimize} \quad 1 + \frac{2}{\pi}(\arcsin(\theta a) + \arcsin(\theta b) + \arcsin(\theta c)) - \alpha(\theta)(1 + a + b + c) \\ &\text{subject to} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a & b \\ a & 1 & c \\ b & c & 1 \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

We want to prove that 0 is its minimal value.

The constraints of the problem can be equivalently written as

$$a, b, c \in [-1, 1] \quad \text{and} \quad a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - 2abc \leq 1.$$

If one of a, b, c, say a, is 1 or -1, then we can verify that the other two satisfy $b - c = 0$ or $b + c = 0$. In either case, we can easily verify that the objective value is equal to or greater than 0. Therefore, we need only to prove that the objective value of (13) subject to the set

$$\{(a, b, c) : \ a, b, c \in (-1, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - 2abc \leq 1\}$$

is equal to or greater than 0.

Actually, we prove that the objective value of (13) subject to a larger set

$$\{(a, b, c) : \ a, b, c \in (-1, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad a + b + c \geq -3/2\}$$

is equal to or greater than 0. Why is this set larger than the previous one? Consider another minimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Minimize} \quad a + b + c \\ &\text{subject to} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a & b \\ a & 1 & c \\ b & c & 1 \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

This is a convex minimization problem and one can verify that its minimal value is $-3/2$ at $a = b = c = -1/2$. Thus,

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & a & b \\ a & 1 & c \\ b & c & 1 \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0$$

implies that

$$a + b + c \geq -3/2.$$

Finally consider the third minimization problem

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Minimize} & 1 + \frac{2}{\pi}(\arcsin(\theta a) + \arcsin(\theta b) + \arcsin(\theta c)) - \alpha(\theta)(1 + a + b + c) \\ \text{subject to} & a + b + c \geq -3/2 \\ & -1 < a, b, c < 1. \end{array} \tag{15}$$

One can see all its KKT points satisfy

$$a^2 = b^2 = c^2,$$

and all of their objective values are equal to or greater then 0, where we use the fact that arcsin() is a monotonely increasing function and $\alpha(\theta)$ here is less than the $\alpha(\theta)$ defined in (2) of Section 2. ■

Now let $\alpha(\theta)$ be given in (12) and $\beta(\theta)$ be given in (3). Let θ^* and R^* be the optimizer and optimal value, respectively, to the following:

$$\max_{0 \leq \theta \leq 1} R(\theta) := \frac{\alpha(\theta)}{\beta(\theta)^2}\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \beta(\theta)}\right)^2.$$

Furthermore, let $\alpha := \alpha(\theta^*)$, $\beta := \beta(\theta^*)$, the random variable

$$z(\gamma) := \frac{w}{w^*} + \gamma\frac{4m}{n^2},$$

where

$$\gamma = \frac{\alpha}{\beta}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\beta}} - 1).$$

Then, Lemma 2 holds for (DSP) and its relaxation (DSDP); and Lemma 3 also holds for $w(\tilde{S})$, i.e.,

$$w(\tilde{S}) \geq \frac{n-2}{n-1} \cdot R^* \cdot w^*,$$

where

$$R^* = \frac{\alpha}{\beta^2}\left(1 - \sqrt{1-\beta}\right)^2.$$

The proof of the latter for case $1/2 \le \delta \le 1$ is identical to the proof of Lemma 3; and the proof of case $0 \le \delta \le 1/2$ is from (10):

$$\begin{aligned} w(\tilde{S}) &\ge w(S) \\ &\ge (\alpha + \gamma\beta - 4\gamma\delta(1-\delta)) \cdot w^* \\ &\ge \frac{\alpha + \gamma\beta - 4\gamma\delta(1-\delta)}{4(1-\delta)^2} \cdot w^* \\ &\ge R^* \cdot w^*. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds by switching δ and $1-\delta$ in the proof of first case.

Now we have the second main result:

Theorem 2 *The worst case performance ratio of the algorithm for the DENSE-$n/2$-SUBGRAPH is at least .519 for sufficiently large n.*

Proof. For n sufficiently large, we verified that for $\theta = .84$, $\alpha(\theta) \ge .7079$ and $\beta(\theta) \ge .9719$, therefore,

$$R^* \ge R(\theta) = \frac{\alpha(\theta)}{\beta(\theta)^2}\left(1 - \sqrt{1-\beta(\theta)}\right)^2 \ge .5193.$$

Following the rest of proof of Frieze and Jerrum [6], we have proved the theorem. ■

6 Strengthened SDP Relaxation of (DSP)

Let us recall and introduce more notations. For a given $0 \le \theta \le 1$, let $\alpha(\theta)$ be in (12) and $\beta(\theta)$ be in (3), and let θ^* and R^* be the optimizer and optimal value, respectively, to the following:

$$\max_{0\le\theta\le 1} R(\theta) := \frac{\alpha(\theta)(2\eta(\theta) - \eta(\theta)^2)}{1 + 4\eta(\theta) - \beta(\theta)(1 + 2\eta(\theta))}$$

where

$$\eta(\theta) = \frac{\sqrt{(9 - 5\beta(\theta))(1-\beta(\theta))} - (1-\beta(\theta))}{2(2-\beta(\theta))}. \tag{16}$$

Then, let $\alpha := \alpha(\theta^*)$, $\beta := \beta(\theta^*)$ and $\eta = \eta(\theta^*)$. Note that

$$0 \le \alpha \le 1, \quad , 0 \le \beta \le 1, \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \le \eta \le 1/2.$$

Our strengthened SDP relaxation of (DSP) is

$$
\text{(DSDP)} \quad \begin{array}{lll} w_{SD} := & \text{Maximize} & \frac{1}{4} \sum_{0<i<j} w_{ij}(1 + X_{0i} + X_{0j} + X_{ij}) \\ & \text{subject to} & \sum_{j=1}^{n} X_{0j} = 0, \\ & & \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} X_{ij} = 0, \\ & & X_{jj} = 1, \quad j = 0, ..., n, \ X \succeq 0. \end{array} \qquad (17)
$$

Here, the unknown $X \in R^{(n+1)\times(n+1)}$, row and column indexed from 0 to n. Note that this SDP relaxation is a strengthened version of the SDPs used in Srivastav and Wolf [16], where there is no constraint $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} X_{ij} = 0$; and used in (9), where there is no constraint $\sum_{j=1}^{n} X_{0j} = 0$. Let $\bar{X}$ be an optimal solution of the strengthened SDP relaxation.

7 Analysis of the Strengthened Approximation of (DSP)

In order to analyze the quality of bisection $\tilde{S}$ resulted from the same rounding procedure used early, we consider three random variables:

$$
w := w(S) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{0<i<j} w_{ij}(1 + \hat{x}_0\hat{x}_i + \hat{x}_0\hat{x}_j + \hat{x}_i\hat{x}_j),
$$

$$
p := n - |S| = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j>0} (1 - \hat{x}_0\hat{x}_j),
$$

and

$$
m := |S|(n - |S|) = \frac{n^2}{4} - \frac{(e^T\hat{x})^2}{4} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i>0,j>0} (1 - \hat{x}_i\hat{x}_j).
$$

Lemma 6 *Our approximation method yields S satisfying the following three inequalities:*

$$
E[w] \geq \alpha \cdot w_{SD} \geq \alpha \cdot w^*,
$$

$$
E[p] \geq \beta \cdot \frac{n}{2},
$$

$$
E[m] \geq \beta \cdot \frac{n^2}{4}.
$$

Proof. The first and third inequalities are proved early. To prove the second inequality, let

$$\alpha^{'} = \min_{-1 \le y < 1} \frac{2}{\pi} \cdot \frac{\arcsin(\theta^*) - \arcsin(\theta^* y)}{1-y}$$

and noting that

$$\sum_{j>0} \bar{X}_{0j} = 0,$$

we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}[n - |S|] &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j>0}\left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi}\arcsin(\theta^* \bar{X}_{0j})\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j>0}\left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi}\arcsin(\theta^*) + \frac{2}{\pi}\arcsin(\theta^*) - \frac{2}{\pi}\arcsin(\theta^* \bar{X}_{0j})\right) \\
&\ge \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j>0}\left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi}\arcsin(\theta^*) + \alpha'(1 - \bar{X}_{0j})\right) \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi}\arcsin(\theta^*) + \alpha'\right) \cdot \frac{n}{2} \\
&\ge \beta \cdot \frac{n}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

■

Consider a new random variable

$$z(\eta, \gamma) := \frac{w}{w^*} + 2\eta\gamma\frac{2p}{n} + \gamma\frac{4m}{n^2}, \tag{18}$$

where η is given by (16) and

$$\gamma = \frac{\alpha}{1 + 4\eta - \beta(1 + 2\eta)}. \tag{19}$$

By lemma 6, we have

$$\mathrm{E}[z(\eta,\gamma)] \ge \alpha + 2\eta\gamma\beta + \gamma\beta \quad \text{and} \quad z(\eta,\gamma) \le 1 + 4\eta\gamma + \gamma(1-\eta)^2.$$

Now we prove the last lemma:

Lemma 7 *If random variable $z(\eta, \gamma)$ fulfills its expectation, i.e., $z(\eta,\gamma) \ge \alpha + (2\eta + 1)\gamma\beta$, then*

$$w(\tilde{S}) \ge \frac{n-2}{n-1} \cdot R^* \cdot w^*,$$

where recall that

$$R^* = \frac{\alpha(2\eta - \eta^2)}{1 + 4\eta - \beta(1 + 2\eta)}.$$

Proof. Suppose

$$w(S) = \lambda w^* \quad \text{and} \quad |S| = \delta n,$$

which from (18) and $z(\eta, \gamma) \geq \alpha + (2\eta + 1)\gamma\beta$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &\geq \alpha + (2\eta + 1)\gamma\beta - 4\eta\gamma(1 - \delta) - 4\gamma\delta(1 - \delta) \\ &= \alpha + (2\eta + 1)\gamma\beta - 4\eta\gamma + 4\delta\gamma(\eta - 1) + 4\delta^2\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the case $1/2 \leq \delta \leq 1$. Applying Lemma 4, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} w(\tilde{S}) &\geq \frac{\frac{n}{2}(\frac{n}{2} - 1)}{\delta n(\delta n - 1)} \cdot w(S) \\ &= \frac{n - 2}{n - \frac{1}{\delta}} \cdot \frac{1}{4\delta^2} \cdot w(S) \\ &\geq \frac{n - 2}{n - 1} \cdot \frac{1}{4\delta^2} \cdot w(S) \\ &= \frac{n - 2}{n - 1} \cdot \frac{\lambda}{4\delta^2} \cdot w^* \\ &\geq \frac{n - 2}{n - 1} \cdot \frac{\alpha + (2\eta + 1)\gamma\beta - 4\eta\gamma + 4\delta\gamma(\eta - 1) + 4\delta^2\gamma}{4\delta^2} \cdot w^* \\ &= \frac{n - 2}{n - 1} \cdot \left(\frac{\alpha + (2\eta + 1)\gamma\beta - 4\eta\gamma}{4\delta^2} + \frac{\gamma(\eta - 1)}{\delta} + \gamma \right) \cdot w^* \\ &\geq \frac{n - 2}{n - 1} \cdot \left(\gamma - \frac{\gamma^2(1 - \eta)^2}{\alpha + (2\eta + 1)\gamma\beta - 4\eta\gamma} \right) \cdot w^* \\ &:= \frac{n - 2}{n - 1} \cdot R_1 \cdot w^*. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from simple calculus that

$$\delta = \frac{\alpha + (2\eta + 1)\gamma\beta - 4\eta\gamma}{2\gamma(1 - \eta)} = \frac{1}{2(1 - \eta)}$$

(the second equality above is from (19) that $\gamma = \alpha + (2\eta + 1)\gamma\beta - 4\eta\gamma$), yields the minimal value for

$$\frac{\alpha + (2\eta + 1)\gamma\beta - 4\eta\gamma}{4\delta^2} + \frac{\gamma(\eta - 1)}{\delta} + \gamma$$

in the interval $[1/2, 1]$.

Consider the case $0 \le \delta \le 1/2$. Applying Lemma 4, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} w(\tilde{S}) &\ge w(S) \\ &\ge (\alpha + (2\eta+1)\gamma\beta - 4\eta\gamma + 4\delta\gamma(\eta-1) + 4\delta^2\gamma) \cdot w^* \\ &\ge \left(\alpha + (2\eta+1)\gamma\beta - 4\eta\gamma - \gamma(1-\eta)^2\right) \cdot w^* \\ &:= R_2 \cdot w^*. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from simple calculus that

$$\delta = \frac{1-\eta}{2}$$

yields the minimal value for

$$\alpha + (2\eta+1)\gamma\beta - 4\eta\gamma + 4\delta\gamma(\eta-1) + 4\delta^2\gamma$$

in the interval $[0, 1/2]$.

Finally, our choice for γ in (19) makes

$$R_1 = R_2 = R^*,$$

which proves the lemma. ∎

Note that η given by (16) maximizes

$$\frac{\alpha(2\eta - \eta^2)}{1 + 4\eta - \beta(1+2\eta)}$$

for any given $0 \le \beta \le 1$ and $\alpha > 0$.

Finally, we have the third main result:

Theorem 3 *The worst case performance ratio of the approximation algorithm for the DENSE-$n/2$-SUBGRAPH is at least $.586$ for sufficiently large n.*

Proof. For sufficiently large n, we verified that for $\theta = .89$, $\alpha(\theta) \ge .7368$ and $\beta(\theta) \ge .9621$, therefore, $\eta(\theta) = .1737$ and

$$R^* = \frac{\alpha(2\eta - \eta^2)}{1 + 4\eta - \beta(1+2\eta)} \ge .5866.$$

Following the rest of proof of Frieze and Jerrum [6], we have the theorem proved. ∎

References

[1] D. Bertsimas and Y. Ye, "Semidefinite relaxations, multivariate normal distributions, and order statistics," *Handbook of Combinatorial Optimization (Vol. 3)*, D.-Z. Du and P.M. Pardalos (Eds.) pp. 1-19, (1998 Kluwer Academic Publishers).

[2] C. C. Choi and Y. Ye, "Application of semidefinite programming to circuit partitioning," *Manuscript*, Aug. 1999.

[3] G. Even, J. Naor, S. Rao and B. Schieber, "Fast approximate graph partitioning algorithms," in *8th SODA*, (1997) pp. 639-648.

[4] U. Feige and M. X. Goemans, "Approximating the value of two prover proof systems, with applications to MAX 2SAT and MAX DICUT," in *Proceedings of the Third Israel Symposium on Theory of Computing and Systems*, (1995) pp. 182-189.

[5] U. Feige and M. Seltser, "On the densest k-subgraph problem," Technical report, Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science, The Weizmann Institute, Rehovot, September 1997.

[6] A. Frieze and M. Jerrum, "Improved approximation algorithms for max k-cut and max bisection," *Proc. 4th IPCO Conference* (1995) 1-13.

[7] N. Garg, H. Saran and V. V. Vazirani, "Finding separator cuts in planar graphs within twice the optimal," in *35th FOCS*, (1994) pp. 14-23.

[8] M. X. Goemans, "Mathematical programming and approximation algorithms," Lecture given at the Summer School on Approximate Solution of Hard Combinatorial Problems, Udine, September 1996.

[9] M. X. Goemans and D. P. Williamson, " Improved approximation algorithms for Maximum Cut and Satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming," *Journal of ACM* 42 (1995) 1115–1145.

[10] T. Leighton and S. Rao, "An approximate max-flow min-cut theorems for uniform multicommodity flow problem with applications to approximation algorithms," in *28th FOCS*, (1988) 256-269.

[11] T. Leighton and S. Rao, "Multicommodity max-flow min-cut theorems and their use in designing approximation algorithms," *Manuscript*, Aug. 1998.

[12] L. Lovasz and A. Shrijver, "Cones of matrices and setfunctions, and 0-1 optimization," *SIAM J. of Optimization* 1 (1990) 166-190.

[13] S. Mahajan and H. Ramesh, "Derandomizing semidefinite programming based approximation algorithms," in *36th FOCS*, (1995) pp. 162-169.

[14] Y. E. Nesterov, "Semidefinite relaxation and nonconvex quadratic optimization," *Optimization Methods and Software* 9 (1998) 141-160.

[15] D. B. Shmoys, "Cut problems and their application to divide-and-conquer," in *Approximation Algorithms for NP-hard Problems*, D. S. Hochbaum (Eds.) pp 192-235, (1996 PWS Publishers).

[16] A. Srivastav and K. Wolf, "Finding dense subgraphs with semidefinite programming," in *Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization*, K. Jansen and J. Rolim (Eds.) (1998) pp. 181-191.

[17] D. P. Williamson, "Lecture notes on approximation algorithms," *Lecture Note*, Fall 1998.

[18] Y. Ye, "A .699-approximation algorithm for Max-Bisection", *Manuscript*, March 1999.

[19] Y. Ye, "Approximating quadratic programming with bound and quadratic constraints," *Mathematical Programming*, 84 (1999) 219-226.

[20] U. Zwick, "Outward rotations: a tool for rounding solutions of semidefinite programming relaxations, with applications to Max-Cut and other problems," in *31th STOC* (1999) 679-687.