

# The Fault-Tolerant Facility Location Problem with Submodular Penalties

Kamiyama, Naoyuki  
Institute of Mathematics for Industry, Kyushu University

<https://hdl.handle.net/2324/1398518>

---

出版情報 : MI Preprint Series. 2013-15, 2013-12-08. Faculty of Mathematics, Kyushu University  
バージョン :  
権利関係 :

# **MI Preprint Series**

**Mathematics for Industry  
Kyushu University**

## **The Fault-Tolerant Facility Location Problem with Submodular Penalties**

**Naoyuki Kamiyama**

**MI 2013-15**

( Received December 8, 2013 )

Institute of Mathematics for Industry  
Graduate School of Mathematics  
Kyushu University  
Fukuoka, JAPAN

# The Fault-Tolerant Facility Location Problem with Submodular Penalties

Naoyuki Kamiyama\*

Institute of Mathematics for Industry, Kyushu University  
kamiyama@imi.kyushu-u.ac.jp

## Abstract

In this paper, we consider the fault-tolerant facility location problem with submodular penalties that is a common generalization of the fault-tolerant facility location problem and the facility location problem with submodular penalties. For this problem, we present a combinatorial  $3 \cdot H_R$ -approximation algorithm, where  $R$  is the maximum connectivity requirement and  $H_R$  is the  $R$ -th harmonic number. Our algorithm is a common generalization of the algorithm for the fault-tolerant facility location problem presented by Jain and Vazirani (2003) and that for the facility location problem with submodular penalties presented by Du, Lu and Xu (2012).

## 1 Introduction

The facility location problem is one of the most important problems in combinatorial optimization. Unfortunately, this problem is **NP**-hard, and thus most of the research has been focusing on designing approximation algorithms with good performance. So far, the best approximation ratio for the facility location problem is 1.488 due to Li [8].

Many variants of the facility location problem have appeared. The fault-tolerant facility location problem is one of variants of the facility location problem. In this problem, each client has a connectivity requirement and we have to connect each client to as many open facilities as its connectivity requirement. This problem was introduced by Jain and Vazirani [7], and several approximation algorithms were presented [7, 5, 11, 1]. So far, the best approximation ratio for the fault-tolerant facility location problem is 1.725 due to Byrka, Srinivasan and Swamy [1].

The facility location problem with submodular penalties is another variant of the facility location problem. In this problem, not all clients are connected to open facilities and unconnected clients incur a penalty cost determined by a monotone submodular function on the client set. This problem was introduced by Hayrapetyan, Swamy and Tardos [6], and several approximation algorithms were presented [6, 2, 3, 9]. So far, the best approximation ratio for the facility location problem with submodular penalties is 2 due to Li, Du, Xiu and Xu [9].

In this paper, we consider the fault-tolerant facility location problem with submodular penalties that is a common generalization of the above two variants of the facility location problem. For this problem, we present a combinatorial  $3 \cdot H_R$ -approximation algorithm, where  $R$  is the maximum connectivity requirement and  $H_R$  is the  $R$ -th harmonic number. Our algorithm is a common generalization of the algorithm for the fault-tolerant facility location problem presented by Jain and Vazirani [7] and that for the facility location problem with submodular penalties presented by Du, Lu and Xu [3].

---

\*This work is partly supported by KAKENHI(24106005).

**Organization.** In Section 2, we give a formal definition of the fault-tolerant facility location problem with submodular penalties. In Section 3, we present an algorithm for the fault-tolerant facility location problem with submodular penalties. In Section 4, we analyze an approximation ratio of our algorithm. Section 5 concludes this paper.

**Notation.** We denote by  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  the sets of real numbers, non-negative real numbers and non-negative integers, respectively.

Assume that we are given a set  $U$ . For each subset  $X$  of  $U$ , we define a characteristic vector  $\chi_X$  in  $\{0, 1\}^U$  by

$$\chi_X(u) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } u \in X \\ 0 & \text{if } u \in U \setminus X. \end{cases}$$

Let  $d_1, d_2$  be vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^U$ . Define a vector  $d_1 \pm d_2$  in  $\mathbb{R}^U$  by

$$(d_1 \pm d_2)(u) := d_1(u) \pm d_2(u).$$

In addition, we write  $d_1 \geq d_2$ , if  $d_1(u) \geq d_2(u)$  for every element  $u$  in  $U$ .

## 2 Problem Formulation

The *fault-tolerant facility location problem with submodular penalties* is defined as follows. We are given a finite set  $F$  of facilities and a finite set  $D$  of clients. For each facility  $i$  in  $F$ , an opening cost  $f_i$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+$  is given. For each client  $j$  in  $D$ , a connectivity requirement  $r_j$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  is given. We assume that  $r_j \leq |F|$  for every client  $j$  in  $D$ . For each facility  $i$  in  $F$  and each client  $j$  in  $D$ , a connecting cost  $c_{i,j}$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+$  is given. We assume that connecting costs satisfy the triangle inequality, i.e.,

$$c_{i,j} + c_{i,j'} + c_{i',j'} \geq c_{i',j}$$

for every facilities  $i, i'$  in  $F$  and every clients  $j, j'$  in  $D$ . In addition, we are given a penalty function  $h: \mathbb{R}_+^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , which is the Lovász extension of a non-negative monotone submodular function  $\rho: 2^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  with  $\rho(\emptyset) = 0$ . We will give formal definitions of a submodular function and its Lovász extension later.

An *assignment* is a triple  $(X, d, \varphi)$  of a subset  $X$  of  $F$ , functions  $d: D \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  and  $\varphi: D \rightarrow 2^F$ . An assignment is said to be *feasible*, if

$$\forall j \in D: \varphi(j) \subseteq X \text{ and } |\varphi(j)| + d(j) = r_j.$$

The *cost*  $\xi(X, d, \varphi)$  of an assignment  $(X, d, \varphi)$  is defined by

$$\xi(X, d, \varphi) := \sum_{i \in X} f_i + \sum_{j \in D} \sum_{i \in \varphi(j)} c_{i,j} + h(d).$$

The goal of the fault-tolerant facility location problem with submodular penalties is to find a feasible assignment with minimum cost.

Here we give formal definitions of a submodular function and its Lovász extension. A function  $\rho: 2^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is said to be *submodular*, if

$$\forall X, Y \subseteq D: \rho(X) + \rho(Y) \geq \rho(X \cup Y) + \rho(X \cap Y). \quad (1)$$

It is well known that (1) is equivalent to

$$\forall X, Y \subseteq D \text{ s.t. } X \subseteq Y, \forall j \in D \setminus Y: \rho(X \cup \{j\}) - \rho(X) \geq \rho(Y \cup \{j\}) - \rho(Y). \quad (2)$$

A submodular function  $\rho: 2^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is said to be *monotone*, if

$$\forall X, Y \subseteq D \text{ s.t. } X \subseteq Y: \rho(X) \leq \rho(Y).$$

The *Lovász extension*  $h: \mathbb{R}_+^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  of a submodular function  $\rho: 2^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is defined as follows. Assume that we are given a vector  $d$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^D$ . We denote by  $\hat{d}_1 > \hat{d}_2 > \dots > \hat{d}_k$  the distinct values of its components and define

$$U_l := \{j \in D \mid d(j) \geq \hat{d}_l\} \quad (3)$$

for each  $l = 1, 2, \dots, k$ . We define  $h(d)$  by

$$h(d) := \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} (\hat{d}_l - \hat{d}_{l+1}) \rho(U_l) + \hat{d}_k \cdot \rho(U_k).$$

It is not difficult to see that  $\rho(X) = h(\chi_X)$  for every subset  $X$  of  $D$ . This implies that the fault-tolerant facility location problem with submodular penalties is a generalization of the facility location problem with submodular penalties.

Here we give properties of the function  $h$  that will be used in the sequel. It is known [4] that  $h(d)$  is equal to the optimal value of the following linear programming (4).

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{j \in D} d(j) \cdot p_j \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{j \in X} p_j \leq \rho(X) \quad (X \subseteq D) \\ & p_j \in \mathbb{R} \quad (j \in D). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

In addition, it follows from the monotonicity of  $\rho$  that  $h$  is also “monotone”.

**Lemma 1.** *For every vectors  $d, d'$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_+^D$  with  $d \geq d'$ , we have  $h(d) \geq h(d')$ .*

*Proof.* We prove this lemma by induction on

$$\|d\| := \sum_{j \in D} d(j).$$

If  $\|d\| = 0$ , then  $h(d) \geq h(d')$  clearly holds for every vector  $d'$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_+^D$  with  $d \geq d'$ . Assuming that this lemma holds for every vector  $d$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_+^D$  with  $\|d\| = \Delta$ , we consider the case of  $\|d\| = \Delta + 1$ . If we can prove that

$$\forall j \in D \text{ s.t. } d(j) > 0: h(d) \geq h(d - \chi_{\{j\}}),$$

then this lemma follows from the induction hypothesis. Let us fix a client  $j$  in  $D$  with  $d(j) > 0$ . We denote by  $\hat{d}_1 > \hat{d}_2 > \dots > \hat{d}_k$  the distinct values of the components of  $d$  and define  $U_l$  by (3) for each  $l = 1, 2, \dots, k$ . Assume that  $d(j) = \hat{d}_s$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} h(d - \chi_{\{j\}}) &:= \sum_{l=1}^{s-1} (\hat{d}_l - \hat{d}_{l+1}) \rho(U_l) + \rho(U_s \setminus \{j\}) + (\hat{d}_s - \hat{d}_{s+1} - 1) \rho(U_s) \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=s+1}^{k-1} (\hat{d}_l - \hat{d}_{l+1}) \rho(U_l) + \hat{d}_k \cdot \rho(U_k). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$h(d) - h(d - \chi_{\{j\}}) = \rho(U_s) - \rho(U_s \setminus \{j\}) \geq 0,$$

where the inequality follows from the monotonicity of  $\rho$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3 Algorithm

In this section, we explain our algorithm for the fault-tolerant facility location problem with submodular penalties. For this, we first define a subproblem  $\mathbf{S}(H, K, \sigma)$  for each subset  $H$  of  $F$ , each subset  $K$  of  $D$  and each function  $\sigma: K \rightarrow 2^H$  as follows. Intuitively, in  $\mathbf{S}(H, K, \sigma)$ , facilities in  $H$  are already open, and each client  $j$  of  $K$  is not allowed to be connected to facilities in  $\sigma(j)$ . Under this constraint, this subproblem asks for opening facilities in  $F \setminus H$  and connecting each client  $j$  in  $K$  to a newly opened facility or a facility in  $H \setminus \sigma(j)$ . Notice that in this problem, a connectivity requirement of each client in  $K$  is equal to one.

A feasible solution of  $\mathbf{S}(H, K, \sigma)$  is a triple  $(Y, P, \psi)$  of a subset  $Y$  of  $F \setminus H$ , a subset  $P$  of  $K$  and a function  $\psi: K \setminus P \rightarrow F$  such that

$$\forall j \in K \setminus P: \psi(j) \in (H \cup Y) \setminus \sigma(j).$$

The *cost*  $\xi_{\mathbf{S}}(Y, P, \psi)$  of a feasible solution  $(Y, P, \psi)$  of  $\mathbf{S}(H, K, \sigma)$  is defined by

$$\xi_{\mathbf{S}}(Y, P, \psi) := \sum_{i \in Y} f_i + \sum_{j \in K \setminus P} c_{\psi(j), j} + \rho(P).$$

The goal of  $\mathbf{S}(H, K, \sigma)$  is to find a feasible solution with minimum cost.

Now we are ready to present our algorithm for the fault-tolerant facility location problem with submodular penalties, called **FTFLwSP**. Define

$$R := \max\{r_j \mid j \in D\}.$$

The algorithm **FTFLwSP** is described as follows.

**Step 1:** Set  $t := R$ ,  $X_{t+1} := \emptyset$ ,  $d_{t+1}(j) := 0$  and  $\varphi_{t+1}(j) := \emptyset$  for each client  $j$  in  $D$ .

**Step 2:** If  $t \geq 1$ , do the following (2-a) to (2-d).

(2-a) Set  $H_t := X_{t+1}$ ,  $K_t := \{j \in D \mid r_j \geq t\}$  and  $\sigma_t(j) := \varphi_{t+1}(j)$  for each client  $j$  in  $K_t$ .

(2-b) Find a feasible solution  $(Y_t, P_t, \psi_t)$  of  $\mathbf{S}(H_t, K_t, \sigma_t)$ .

(2-c) Set  $X_t := X_{t+1} \cup Y_t$ ,  $d_t := d_{t+1} + \chi_{P_t}$ , and

$$\varphi_t(j) := \begin{cases} \varphi_{t+1}(j) \cup \{\psi_t(j)\} & \text{if } j \in K_t \setminus P_t \\ \varphi_{t+1}(j) & \text{if } j \in (D \setminus K_t) \cup P_t. \end{cases}$$

(2-d) Update  $t := t - 1$  and go to **Step 2**.

**Step 3:** Output  $(X_1, d_1, \varphi_1)$ .

In **Step 2** of the  $t$ -th iteration, we connect a client  $j$  in  $D$  with  $r_j \geq t$  to some open facility or increase its penalty by one. Hence, the output  $(X_1, d_1, \varphi_1)$  is clearly a feasible assignment. Notice that an approximation ratio of the algorithm **FTFLwSP** depends on the quality of  $(Y_t, P_t, \psi_t)$  in **Step (2-b)**. In addition, if we can find  $(Y_t, P_t, \psi_t)$  in polynomial time, then the algorithm **FTFLwSP** is also a polynomial-time algorithm. We will discuss these points in the next section.

## 4 Analysis

In this section, we analyze an approximation ratio of the algorithm FTFLwSP. An IP formulation of the fault-tolerant facility location problem with submodular penalties is described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \sum_{i \in F} f_i y_i + \sum_{i \in F} \sum_{j \in D} c_{i,j} x_{i,j} + h(d) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i \in F} x_{i,j} + d(j) \geq r_j \quad (j \in D) \\
& x_{i,j} \leq y_i \quad (i \in F, j \in D) \\
& x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} \quad (i \in F, j \in D) \\
& y_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad (i \in F) \\
& d \in \mathbb{Z}_+^D.
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Notice that it follows from Lemma 1 that there exists an optimal solution of (5) such that the first constraint holds with equality for every client  $j$  in  $D$ . Denote by  $\text{OPT}$  the optimal value of (5), i.e., the fault-tolerant facility location problem with submodular penalties.

Here we consider an LP relaxation of (5). The dual problem of (4) is described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \sum_{X \subseteq D} \rho(X) \cdot q_X \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{X \subseteq D: j \in X} q_X = d(j) \quad (j \in D) \\
& q_X \geq 0 \quad (X \subseteq D).
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

It follows from (6) that an LP relaxation of (5) can be described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \sum_{i \in F} f_i y_i + \sum_{i \in F} \sum_{j \in D} c_{i,j} x_{i,j} + \sum_{X \subseteq D} \rho(X) \cdot q_X \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i \in F} x_{i,j} + \sum_{X \subseteq D: j \in X} q_X \geq r_j \quad (j \in D) \\
& x_{i,j} \leq y_i \quad (i \in F, j \in D) \\
& x_{i,j} \geq 0 \quad (i \in F, j \in D) \\
& 0 \leq y_i \leq 1 \quad (i \in F) \\
& q_X \geq 0 \quad (X \subseteq D).
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Denote by  $\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}$  the optimal value of (7). Notice that  $\text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \leq \text{OPT}$  holds. The dual problem of (7) is described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & \sum_{j \in D} r_j \alpha_j - \sum_{i \in F} z_i \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \alpha_j - \beta_{i,j} \leq c_{i,j} \quad (i \in F, j \in D) \\
& \sum_{j \in D} \beta_{i,j} \leq f_i + z_i \quad (i \in F) \\
& \sum_{j \in X} \alpha_j \leq \rho(X) \quad (X \subseteq D) \\
& \alpha_j \geq 0 \quad (j \in D) \\
& \beta_{i,j} \geq 0 \quad (i \in F, j \in D) \\
& z_i \geq 0 \quad (i \in F).
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Next we consider an IP formulation of  $S(H_t, K_t, \sigma_t)$ . Define a new function  $\rho_{K_t}: 2^{K_t} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  by  $\rho_{K_t}(X) := \rho(X)$  for each subset  $X$  of  $K_t$ . It is clear that  $\rho_{K_t}$  is submodular. Let  $h_{K_t}: \mathbb{R}_+^{K_t} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  be the Lovász extension of  $\rho_{K_t}$ . An IP formulation of  $S(H_t, K_t, \sigma_t)$  is described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \sum_{i \in F \setminus H_t} f_i y_i + \sum_{i \in F} \sum_{j \in K_t} c_{i,j} x_{i,j} + h_{K_t}(d) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i \in F \setminus \sigma_t(j)} x_{i,j} + d(j) \geq 1 \quad (j \in K_t) \\
& x_{i,j} \leq y_i \quad (i \in F \setminus H_t, j \in K_t) \\
& x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\} \quad (i \in F, j \in K_t) \\
& y_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad (i \in F \setminus H_t) \\
& d \in \{0, 1\}^{K_t}.
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Similarly to (7), an LP relaxation of (9) is described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \sum_{i \in F \setminus H_t} f_i y_i + \sum_{i \in F} \sum_{j \in K_t} c_{i,j} x_{i,j} + \sum_{X \subseteq K_t} \rho_{K_t}(X) \cdot q_X \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i \in F \setminus \sigma_t(j)} x_{i,j} + \sum_{X \subseteq K_t: j \in X} q_X \geq 1 \quad (j \in K_t) \\
& x_{i,j} \leq y_i \quad (i \in F \setminus H_t, j \in K_t) \\
& x_{i,j} \geq 0 \quad (i \in F, j \in K_t) \\
& y_i \geq 0 \quad (i \in F \setminus H_t) \\
& q_X \geq 0 \quad (X \subseteq K_t).
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Denote by  $\text{OPT}_{\text{SLP}}(t)$  the optimal value of (10). The dual problem of (10) is described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & \sum_{i \in K_t} \alpha_i \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \alpha_j - \beta_{i,j} \leq c_{i,j} \quad (j \in K_t, i \in F \setminus H_t) \\
& \alpha_j \leq c_{i,j} \quad (j \in K_t, i \in H_t \setminus \sigma_t(j)) \\
& \sum_{j \in K_t} \beta_{i,j} \leq f_i \quad (i \in F \setminus H_t) \\
& \sum_{j \in X} \alpha_j \leq \rho_{K_t}(X) \quad (X \subseteq K_t) \\
& \alpha_j \geq 0 \quad (j \in K_t) \\
& \beta_{i,j} \geq 0 \quad (i \in F \setminus H_t, j \in K_t).
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

From now on, we analyze an approximation ratio of the algorithm FTFLwSP.

**Lemma 2.** *For every  $t = 1, 2, \dots, R$ , we can find a feasible solution  $(Y_t, P_t, \psi_t)$  of  $S(H_t, K_t, \sigma_t)$  such that*

$$\xi_S(Y_t, P_t, \psi_t) \leq 3 \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{SLP}}(t)$$

*in polynomial time.*

We will give the proof of Lemma 2 in the next subsection.

**Lemma 3.** *For every  $t = 1, 2, \dots, R$ , we have*

$$\text{OPT}_{\text{SLP}}(t) \leq \frac{1}{t} \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}}.$$



*Proof.* It follow from the strong duality theorem that there exists a feasible solution

$$\alpha_j \ (j \in K_t), \quad \beta_{i,j} \ (i \in F \setminus H_t, j \in K_t)$$

of (11) with

$$\sum_{j \in K_t} \alpha_j = \text{OPT}_{\text{SLP}}(t).$$

To prove the theorem, we construct a feasible solution

$$\hat{\alpha}_j \ (j \in D), \quad \hat{\beta}_{i,j} \ (i \in F, j \in D), \quad \hat{z}_i \ (i \in F)$$

of (8) with

$$\sum_{j \in D} r_j \hat{\alpha}_j - \sum_{i \in F} \hat{z}_i \geq t \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{SLP}}(t).$$

It follows from the weak duality theorem that

$$\sum_{j \in D} r_j \hat{\alpha}_j - \sum_{i \in F} \hat{z}_i \leq \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}},$$

which completes the proof.

We first define  $\hat{\alpha}_j$  for each client  $j$  in  $D$  by

$$\hat{\alpha}_j := \begin{cases} \alpha_j & \text{if } j \in K_t \\ 0 & \text{if } j \in D \setminus K_t. \end{cases}$$

Next we define  $\hat{\beta}_{i,j}$  for each facility  $i$  in  $F$  and each client  $j$  in  $D$  by

$$\hat{\beta}_{i,j} := \begin{cases} \beta_{i,j} & \text{if } j \in K_t \text{ and } i \in F \setminus H_t \\ 0 & \text{if } j \in K_t \text{ and } i \in H_t \setminus \sigma_t(j) \\ \alpha_j & \text{if } j \in K_t \text{ and } i \in \sigma_t(j) \\ 0 & \text{if } j \in D \setminus K_t \text{ and } i \in F. \end{cases}$$

Finally, we define  $\hat{z}_i$  for each facility  $i$  in  $F$  by

$$\hat{z}_i := \begin{cases} \sum_{j \in K_t: i \in \sigma_t(j)} \alpha_j & \text{if } i \in H_t \\ 0 & \text{if } i \in F \setminus H_t. \end{cases}$$

Here we prove that  $\hat{\alpha}_i$ ,  $\hat{\beta}_{i,j}$  and  $\hat{z}_i$  are a feasible solution of (8). We first consider the first constraint. For each client  $j$  in  $K_t$  and each facility  $i$  in  $F \setminus H_t$ ,

$$\hat{\alpha}_j - \hat{\beta}_{i,j} = \alpha_j - \beta_{i,j} \leq c_{i,j}.$$

For each client  $j$  in  $K_t$  and each facility  $i$  in  $H_t \setminus \sigma_t(j)$ ,

$$\hat{\alpha}_j - \hat{\beta}_{i,j} = \alpha_j - 0 = \alpha_j \leq c_{i,j}.$$

For each client  $j$  in  $K_t$  and each facility  $i$  in  $\sigma_t(j)$ ,

$$\hat{\alpha}_j - \hat{\beta}_{i,j} = \alpha_j - \alpha_j = 0 \leq c_{i,j}.$$

For each client  $j$  in  $D \setminus K_t$  and each facility  $i$  in  $F$ ,

$$\hat{\alpha}_j - \hat{\beta}_{i,j} = 0 - 0 = 0 \leq c_{i,j}.$$

Next we consider the second constraint. For each facility  $i$  in  $H_t$ ,

$$\sum_{j \in D} \hat{\beta}_{i,j} = \sum_{j \in K_t} \hat{\beta}_{i,j} = \sum_{j \in K_t: i \in \sigma_t(j)} \alpha_j = \hat{z}_i \leq f_i + \hat{z}_i.$$

For each facility  $i$  in  $F \setminus H_t$ ,

$$\sum_{j \in D} \hat{\beta}_{i,j} = \sum_{j \in K_t} \beta_{i,j} \leq f_i \leq f_i + \hat{z}_i.$$

Finally, we consider the third constraint. For each subset  $X$  of  $K_t$ .

$$\sum_{j \in X} \hat{\alpha}_j = \sum_{j \in X} \alpha_j \leq \rho_{K_t}(X) = \rho(X).$$

For each subset  $X$  of  $D$  with  $X \setminus K_t \neq \emptyset$ .

$$\sum_{j \in X} \hat{\alpha}_j = \sum_{j \in X \cap K_t} \alpha_j \leq \rho_{K_t}(X \cap K_t) = \rho(X \cap K_t) \leq \rho(X),$$

where the last inequality follows from the monotonicity of  $\rho$ .

Next we consider the objective value.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in D} r_j \hat{\alpha}_j - \sum_{i \in F} \hat{z}_i &= \sum_{j \in K_t} r_j \alpha_j - \sum_{i \in H_t} \sum_{j \in K_t: i \in \sigma_t(j)} \alpha_j \\ &= \sum_{j \in K_t} r_j \alpha_j - \sum_{j \in K_t} \sum_{i \in \sigma_t(j)} \alpha_j \\ &= \sum_{j \in K_t} r_j \alpha_j - \sum_{j \in K_t} |\sigma_t(j)| \alpha_j \\ &= \sum_{j \in K_t} (r_j - |\varphi_{t+1}(j)|) \alpha_j \quad (\text{by } \sigma_t(j) = \varphi_{t+1}(j)) \\ &\geq \sum_{j \in K_t} (r_j - (r_j - t)) \alpha_j \quad (\text{by } |\varphi_{t+1}(j)| \leq r_j - t) \\ &= \sum_{j \in K_t} t \cdot \alpha_j \\ &= t \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{SLP}}(t). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

**Lemma 4.** For every vector  $d$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_+^D$  and every subset  $X$  of  $D$ , we have

$$h(d + \chi_X) - h(d) \leq h(\chi_X) = \rho(X). \quad (12)$$

*Proof.* If  $d(j) = 0$  for every client  $j$  in  $D$ , then (12) clearly holds. Assume that there exists a client  $j$  in  $D$  with  $d(j) > 0$ . To prove (12), it suffices to prove that there exists a client  $j^*$  in  $D$  such that  $d(j^*) > 0$  and

$$h(d + \chi_X) - h(d) \leq h(d^* + \chi_X) - h(d^*), \quad (13)$$

where the vector  $d^*$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^D$  is define by  $d^* := d - \chi_{\{j^*\}}$ .

We denote by  $\hat{d}_1 > \hat{d}_2 > \dots > \hat{d}_k$  the distinct values of the components of  $d$  and define

$$\begin{aligned} U_l &:= \{j \in D \mid d(j) \geq \hat{d}_l\} \\ X_l &:= \{j \in X \mid d(j) = \hat{d}_l\} \\ \overline{X}_l &:= \{j \in D \setminus X \mid d(j) = \hat{d}_l\} \\ U_l^+ &:= U_{l-1} \cup X_l \end{aligned}$$

for each  $l = 1, 2, \dots, k$ , where define  $U_0 := \emptyset$ . Define  $j^*$  in  $D$  by

$$j^* := \begin{cases} \text{a client in } \overline{X}_k & \text{if } \hat{d}_k \neq 0 \text{ and } \overline{X}_k \neq \emptyset \\ \text{a client in } X_k & \text{if } \hat{d}_k \neq 0 \text{ and } \overline{X}_k = \emptyset \\ \text{a client in } \overline{X}_{k-1} & \text{if } \hat{d}_k = 0 \text{ and } \overline{X}_{k-1} \neq \emptyset \\ \text{a client in } X_{k-1} & \text{if } \hat{d}_k = 0 \text{ and } \overline{X}_{k-1} = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

First we calculate the left-hand side of (13). Since

$$\begin{aligned} h(d) &= \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} (\hat{d}_l - \hat{d}_{l+1}) \rho(U_l) + \hat{d}_k \cdot \rho(U_k) \\ h(d + \chi_X) &= \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \left( \rho(U_l^+) + (\hat{d}_l - \hat{d}_{l+1} - 1) \rho(U_l) \right) + \rho(U_k^+) + \hat{d}_k \cdot \rho(U_k), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$h(d + \chi_X) - h(d) = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \left( \rho(U_l^+) - \rho(U_l) \right) + \rho(U_k^+).$$

Next we consider the right-hand side of (13). Assume that  $\hat{d}_k \neq 0$  and  $\overline{X}_k \neq \emptyset$ . In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} h(d^*) &= \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} (\hat{d}_l - \hat{d}_{l+1}) \rho(U_l) + \rho(U_k \setminus \{j^*\}) + (\hat{d}_k - 1) \cdot \rho(U_k) \\ h(d^* + \chi_X) &= \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \left( \rho(U_l^+) + (\hat{d}_l - \hat{d}_{l+1} - 1) \rho(U_l) \right) \\ &\quad + \rho(U_k^+) + \rho(U_k \setminus \{j^*\}) + (\hat{d}_k - 1) \cdot \rho(U_k). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$h(d^* + \chi_X) - h(d^*) = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \left( \rho(U_l^+) - \rho(U_l) \right) + \rho(U_k^+),$$

which implies that (13) holds.

Assume that  $\hat{d}_k \neq 0$  and  $\overline{X}_k = \emptyset$ . In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} h(d^*) &= \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} (\hat{d}_l - \hat{d}_{l+1}) \rho(U_l) + \rho(U_k \setminus \{j^*\}) + (\hat{d}_k - 1) \cdot \rho(U_k) \\ h(d^* + \chi_X) &= \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \left( \rho(U_l^+) + (\hat{d}_l - \hat{d}_{l+1} - 1) \rho(U_l) \right) + \rho(U_k^+ \setminus \{j^*\}) + \hat{d}_k \cdot \rho(U_k^+). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, since  $U_k = U_k^+$ , we have

$$h(d^* + \chi_X) - h(d^*) = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \left( \rho(U_l^+) - \rho(U_l) \right) + \rho(U_k^+),$$

which implies that (13) holds.

Assume that  $\hat{d}_k = 0$  and  $\overline{X}_{k-1} \neq \emptyset$ . We first consider the case of  $\hat{d}_{k-1} > 1$ . In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} h(d^*) &= \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} (\hat{d}_l - \hat{d}_{l+1}) \rho(U_l) + \rho(U_{k-1} \setminus \{j^*\}) + (\hat{d}_{k-1} - 1) \cdot \rho(U_{k-1}) \\ h(d^* + \chi_X) &= \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} \left( \rho(U_l^+) + (\hat{d}_l - \hat{d}_{l+1} - 1) \rho(U_l) \right) \\ &\quad + \rho(U_{k-1}^+) + \rho(U_{k-1} \setminus \{j^*\}) + (\hat{d}_{k-1} - 2) \cdot \rho(U_{k-1}) + \rho(U_k^+). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$h(d^* + \chi_X) - h(d^*) = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \left( \rho(U_l^+) - \rho(U_l) \right) + \rho(U_k^+),$$

which implies that (13) holds. If  $\hat{d}_{k-1} = 1$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(d^*) &= \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} (\hat{d}_l - \hat{d}_{l+1}) \rho(U_l) + \rho(U_{k-1} \setminus \{j^*\}) \\ h(d^* + \chi_X) &= \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} \left( \rho(U_l^+) + (\hat{d}_l - \hat{d}_{l+1} - 1) \rho(U_l) \right) + \rho(U_{k-1}^+) + \rho(U_k^+ \setminus \{j^*\}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(d^* + \chi_X) - h(d^*) &= \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \left( \rho(U_l^+) - \rho(U_l) \right) + \rho(U_{k-1}) + \rho(U_k^+ \setminus \{j^*\}) - \rho(U_{k-1} \setminus \{j^*\}) \\ &\geq \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \left( \rho(U_l^+) - \rho(U_l) \right) + \rho(U_k^+), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from (2) and  $U_{k-1} \subseteq U_k^+$ . This implies that (13) holds.

Assume that  $\hat{d}_k = 0$  and  $\overline{X}_{k-1} = \emptyset$ . In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} h(d^*) &= \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} (\hat{d}_l - \hat{d}_{l+1}) \rho(U_l) + \rho(U_{k-1} \setminus \{j^*\}) + (\hat{d}_{k-1} - 1) \cdot \rho(U_{k-1}) \\ h(d^* + \chi_X) &= \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} \left( \rho(U_l^+) + (\hat{d}_l - \hat{d}_{l+1} - 1) \rho(U_l) \right) \\ &\quad + \rho(U_{k-1}^+ \setminus \{j^*\}) + (\hat{d}_{k-1} - 1) \rho(U_{k-1}^+) + \rho(U_k^+). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, since  $U_{k-1} = U_{k-1}^+$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(d^* + \chi_X) - h(d^*) &= \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} \left( \rho(U_l^+) - \rho(U_l) \right) + \rho(U_k^+) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \left( \rho(U_l^+) - \rho(U_l) \right) + \rho(U_k^+). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

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

**Theorem 5.** *We have*

$$\xi(X_1, d_1, \varphi_1) \leq 3 \cdot H_R \cdot \text{OPT},$$

where  $H_R := 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \dots + \frac{1}{R}$ .

*Proof.* It follows from Lemma 4 that

$$\forall t = 1, \dots, R: \xi(X_t, d_t, \varphi_t) - \xi(X_{t+1}, d_{t+1}, \varphi_{t+1}) \leq \xi_S(Y_t, P_t, \psi_t). \quad (14)$$

Thus, it follows from (14) that

$$\xi(X_1, d_1, \varphi_1) \leq \sum_{t=1}^R \xi_S(Y_t, P_t, \psi_t). \quad (15)$$

Hence, it follows from (15) and Lemmas 3, 4 that

$$\xi(X_1, d_1, \varphi_1) \leq \sum_{t=1}^R 3 \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{SLP}}(t) \leq 3 \cdot H_R \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{LP}} \leq 3 \cdot H_R \cdot \text{OPT}.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

#### 4.1 Proof of Lemma 2

In this subsection, we prove Lemma 2. Our algorithm for  $\mathcal{S}(H_t, K_t, \sigma_t)$  is essentially the same as the algorithm proposed by Du, Lu and Xu [3] except the following differences.

- The opening cost of a facility in  $H_t$  is zero.
- The connection cost between a client  $j$  in  $K_t$  and a facility  $i$  in  $\sigma_t(j)$  is infinite.

For completeness, we reproduce the algorithm of Du, Lu and Xu [3] in our setting. Define a modified opening cost  $\hat{f}_i$  for each facility  $i$  in  $F$  by

$$\hat{f}_i := \begin{cases} f_i & \text{if } i \in F \setminus H_t \\ 0 & \text{if } i \in H_t. \end{cases}$$

Define a modified connecting cost  $\hat{c}_{i,j}$  for each facility  $i$  in  $F$  and each client  $j$  in  $K_t$  by

$$\hat{c}_{i,j} := \begin{cases} c_{i,j} & \text{if } i \in F \setminus \sigma(j) \\ \infty & \text{if } i \in \sigma(j). \end{cases}$$

Notice that connecting costs do not necessarily satisfy the triangle inequality.

Our algorithm consists of two phases. In the first phase, we use a concept of time  $\delta$ . The algorithm starts at  $\delta = 0$ . Initially, we set  $\alpha_j := 0$  for each client  $j$  in  $K_t$  and  $\beta_{i,j} := 0$  for each facility  $j$  in  $F \setminus H_t$  and each client  $j$  in  $K_t$ . Facilities  $i$  in  $F$  with  $\hat{f}_i > 0$  are *closed*, and facilities  $i$  in  $F$  with  $\hat{f}_i = 0$  are *open*. Every client in  $K_t$  is *unfrozen*. Let  $P$  be the set of penalized client, and set  $P := \emptyset$ .

The algorithm increases  $\alpha_j$  for all unfrozen clients  $j$  in  $K_t$  uniformly at the unit rate  $\delta$ , and declares the pair  $(i, j)$  of a facility  $i$  in  $F$  and a client  $j$  in  $K_t$  *tight*, if  $\alpha_j = \hat{c}_{i,j}$ . Once the pair  $(i, j)$  is tight, it increases  $\beta_{i,j}$  at the same rate as  $\alpha_j$  so that  $\alpha_j - \beta_{i,j} = \hat{c}_{i,j}$  is satisfied. The algorithm keeps increasing  $\delta$  until there exists no unfrozen client. As  $\delta$  increases, the following events may occur.

**Event 1.** If

$$\sum_{j \in K_t} \beta_{i,j} = \hat{f}_i$$

for a closed facility  $i$  in  $F$ , then  $i$  is *temporarily open*. In addition, the algorithm *freezes* unfrozen clients  $j$  in  $K_t$  with  $\beta_{i,j} > 0$  and we call  $i$  the *witness* for  $j$ .

**Event 2.** If  $\alpha_j = \hat{c}_{i,j}$  for an open/temporarily open facility  $i$  and an unfrozen client  $j$ , then the algorithm *freezes*  $j$  and we call  $i$  the witness for  $j$ .

**Event 3.** If

$$\sum_{j \in X} \alpha_j = \rho_{K_t}(X)$$

for a subset  $X$  of  $K_t$ , then the algorithm *freezes* unfrozen clients in  $X$  and adds all elements in  $X$  to  $P$ .

If several events occur simultaneously, the algorithm executes them in an arbitrary order.

Next we explain the second phase. Denote by  $T$  the set of temporarily open facilities in  $F$ . Facilities  $i, i'$  in  $F$  are said to be *dependent*, if there exists a client  $j$  in  $K_t$  such that  $\beta_{i,j} > 0$  and  $\beta_{i',j} > 0$ . In this phase, we first choose a maximal independent subset  $T'$  of  $T$ , and facilities in  $T'$  are open. Then, the algorithm outputs  $(Y_t, P_t, \psi_t)$  defined as follows.

- Define  $Y_t$  as the set of open facilities in  $F \setminus H_t$ .
- Define  $P_t := P$ .
- For each client  $j$  in  $K_t \setminus P_t$ , define  $\psi_t(j)$  as an open facility  $i$  in  $F$  minimizing  $\hat{c}_{i,j}$ .

In the same as the proof of Lemma 3.1 of [3], we can prove that this algorithm can be implemented in polynomial time. Furthermore, since the pair  $(i, j)$  of a client  $j$  in  $K_t$  and a facility  $i$  in  $\sigma_t(j)$  never be tight,  $(Y_t, P_t, \psi_t)$  is a feasible solution of  $S(H_t, K_t, \sigma_t)$ .

From now on, we analyze an approximation ratio of the algorithm. In the same as Lemma 3.2 of [3], we can prove that during the algorithm's execution, we have

$$\sum_{j \in P} \alpha_j = \rho_{K_t}(P).$$

It follows from this observation that

$$\alpha_j \ (j \in K_t), \quad \beta_{i,j} \ (i \in H_t \setminus K_t, j \in K_t) \tag{16}$$

obtained in the first phase is a feasible solution of (11), which implies

$$\sum_{j \in K_t} \alpha_j \leq \text{OPT}_{\text{SLP}}(t).$$

We denote by  $F_{\text{op}}$  the set of open facilities in  $F$ . For each client  $j$  in  $K_t \setminus P_t$ , we denote by  $w(j)$  the witness for  $j$ . For each open facility  $j$  in  $F$ , we denote by  $N_i$  the set of clients  $j$  in  $K_t$  with  $\beta_{i,j} > 0$ . Notice that  $N_i \cap N_{i'}$  is empty for every distinct facilities  $i, i'$  in  $F_{\text{op}}$ . Define

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{po}} &:= \{j \in K_t \setminus P_t \mid \exists i \in F_{\text{op}}: j \in N_i\} \\ D_1 &:= \{j \in K_t \setminus (P_t \cup D_{\text{po}}) \mid w(j) \in F_{\text{op}}\} \\ D_2 &:= K_t \setminus (P_t \cup D_{\text{po}} \cup D_1). \end{aligned}$$

Now we prove

$$\sum_{j \in K_t \setminus P_t} c_{\psi_t(j),j} = \sum_{j \in K_t \setminus P_t} \hat{c}_{\psi_t(j),j} \leq \sum_{i \in F_{\text{op}}} \sum_{j \in N_i \setminus P_t} \hat{c}_{i,j} + \sum_{j \in D_1} \alpha_j + \sum_{j \in D_2} 3 \cdot \alpha_j. \quad (17)$$

The first inequality follows from the fact that no client  $j$  in  $K_t$  is not connected to facilities in  $\sigma(j)$ . For proving the second inequality, we consider the following three cases.

**Case 1.** We first consider the connecting costs for clients in  $D_{\text{po}}$ . For each client  $j$  in  $D_{\text{po}}$ , we denote by  $\mathbf{p}(j)$  the unique facility  $i$  in  $F_{\text{op}}$  with  $j \in N_i$ . We have

$$\sum_{j \in D_{\text{po}}} \hat{c}_{\psi_t(j),j} \leq \sum_{j \in D_{\text{po}}} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{p}(j),j} \leq \sum_{i \in F_{\text{op}}} \sum_{j \in N_i} \hat{c}_{i,j}.$$

**Case 2.** Next we consider the connecting cost for a client  $j$  in  $D_1$ . Since  $\mathbf{w}(j)$  is open and  $j$  is not in  $D_{\text{po}}$ , we have  $\beta_{\mathbf{w}(j),j} = 0$ . This implies that the event 2 occurred when the algorithm froze  $j$ , i.e.,  $\alpha_j = \hat{c}_{\mathbf{w}(j),j}$ . Thus, since  $\mathbf{w}(j)$  is open, we have

$$\sum_{j \in D_1} \hat{c}_{\psi_t(j),j} \leq \sum_{j \in D_1} \hat{c}_{\mathbf{w}(j),j} = \sum_{j \in D_1} \alpha_j.$$

**Case 3.** Here we consider the connecting cost for a client  $j$  in  $D_2$ . Define  $i := \mathbf{w}(j)$ . In this case, there exist an open facility  $i'$  in  $F$  and a client  $j'$  in  $K_t$  such that  $\beta_{i,j'} > 0$  and  $\beta_{i',j'} > 0$ . Since  $\beta_{i,j'}$  and  $\beta_{i',j'}$  are positive,  $i$  and  $i'$  are not in  $H_t$ . This implies that the triangle inequality holds for  $\hat{c}_{i,j}$ ,  $\hat{c}_{i',j}$ ,  $\hat{c}_{i,j'}$  and  $\hat{c}_{i',j'}$ . Let  $t_i$  and  $t_{i'}$  be the times at which  $i$  and  $i'$  are temporarily open, respectively. In addition, the following facts immediately follow.

- Since  $i$  is the witness for  $j$ , we have  $\alpha_j \geq t_i$  and  $\alpha_j \geq \hat{c}_{i,j}$ .
- Since the pairs  $(i, j')$  and  $(i', j')$  are tight, we have  $\alpha_{j'} \geq \hat{c}_{i,j'}$  and  $\alpha_{j'} \geq \hat{c}_{i',j'}$ .
- Since  $j'$  is frozen earlier than the time  $\min\{t_i, t_{i'}\}$ , we have  $\alpha_{j'} \leq \min\{t_i, t_{i'}\}$ .

It follows from these facts and the triangle inequality that

$$\hat{c}_{\psi_t(j),j} \leq \hat{c}_{i',j} \leq \hat{c}_{i,j} + \hat{c}_{i,j'} + \hat{c}_{i',j'} \leq 2\alpha_{j'} + \alpha_j \leq 3\alpha_j.$$

Hence, we have

$$\sum_{j \in D_2} \hat{c}_{\psi_t(j),j} \leq \sum_{j \in D_2} 3 \cdot \alpha_j,$$

which completes the proof of (17).

Since  $N_i \cap N_{i'}$  is empty for every distinct facilities  $i, i'$  in  $F_{\text{op}}$ , we have

$$\sum_{i \in Y_t} f_i = \sum_{i \in F_{\text{op}}} \sum_{j \in N_i} \beta_{i,j}$$

In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in F_{\text{op}}} \sum_{j \in N_i} \beta_{i,j} + \sum_{i \in F_{\text{op}}} \sum_{j \in N_i \setminus P_t} \hat{c}_{i,j} &\leq \sum_{i \in F_{\text{op}}} \sum_{j \in N_i} (\beta_{i,j} + \hat{c}_{i,j}) \\ &\leq \sum_{j \in D_{\text{po}}} \alpha_j + \sum_{j \in P_t} \alpha_j. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from these observations and (17) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in Y_t} f_i + \sum_{j \in K_t \setminus P_t} c_{\psi_t(j),j} + \rho_{K_t}(P_t) &\leq \sum_{j \in D_{po}} \alpha_j + \sum_{j \in D_1} \alpha_j + \sum_{j \in D_2} 3 \cdot \alpha_j + \sum_{j \in P_t} 2 \cdot \alpha_j \\
&\leq 3 \sum_{j \in K_t} \alpha_j \\
&\leq 3 \cdot \text{OPT}_{\text{SLP}}(t).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced the fault-tolerant facility location problem with submodular penalties, and presented a combinatorial  $3 \cdot H_R$ -approximation algorithm, where  $R$  is the maximum connectivity requirement. One direction of future work is to improve an approximation ratio. To discern whether we can extend a constant approximation algorithm for the fault-tolerant facility location problem to our problem is interesting. Another direction is to generalize a penalty function. In discrete convex analysis, it is known that the Lovász extensions of submodular functions coincide with polyhedral L-convex functions that are positively homogenous (see [10] for discrete convex analysis). Thus, it is interesting to consider the problem in which the Lovász extension is replaced by a more general discrete convex function.

## References

- [1] J. Byrka, A. Srinivasan, and C. Swamy. Fault-tolerant facility location: A randomized dependent LP-rounding algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 14th Conference on Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*, volume 6080 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 244–257, 2010.
- [2] F. A. Chudak and K. Nagano. Efficient solutions to relaxations of combinatorial problems with submodular penalties via the Lovász extension and non-smooth convex optimization. In *Proceedings of the 18th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 79–88, 2007.
- [3] D. Du, R. Lu, and D. Xu. A primal-dual approximation algorithm for the facility location problem with submodular penalties. *Algorithmica*, 63(1-2):191–200, 2012.
- [4] J. Edmonds. Submodular functions, matroids, and certain polyhedra. In R. Guy, H. Hanani, N. Sauer, and J. Schönheim, editors, *Combinatorial Structures and their Applications*, pages 69–87. Gordon and Breach, 1970.
- [5] S. Guha, A. Meyerson, and K. Munagala. A constant factor approximation algorithm for the fault-tolerant facility location problem. *Journal of Algorithms*, 48(2):429–440, 2003.
- [6] A. Hayrapetyan, C. Swamy, and É. Tardos. Network design for information networks. In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 933–942, 2005.
- [7] K. Jain and V. V. Vazirani. An approximation algorithm for the fault tolerant metric facility location problem. *Algorithmica*, 38(3):433–439, 2003.



- [8] S. Li. A 1.488 approximation algorithm for the uncapacitated facility location problem. *Information and Computation*, 222:45–58, 2013.
- [9] Y. Li, D. Du, N. Xiu, and D. Xu. Improved approximation algorithms for the facility location problems with linear/submodular penalty. In *Proceedings of the 19th Annual International Computing and Combinatorics Conference*, volume 7936 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 292–303, 2013.
- [10] K. Murota. *Discrete Convex Analysis*, volume 10 of *SIAM Monographs on Discrete Mathematics and Applications*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2003.
- [11] C. Swamy and D. B. Shmoys. Fault-tolerant facility location. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 4(4), 2008.

# List of MI Preprint Series, Kyushu University

## The Global COE Program Math-for-Industry Education & Research Hub

MI

- MI2008-1 Takahiro ITO, Shuichi INOKUCHI & Yoshihiro MIZOGUCHI  
Abstract collision systems simulated by cellular automata
- MI2008-2 Eiji ONODERA  
The initial value problem for a third-order dispersive flow into compact almost Hermitian manifolds
- MI2008-3 Hiroaki KIDO  
On isosceles sets in the 4-dimensional Euclidean space
- MI2008-4 Hirofumi NOTSU  
Numerical computations of cavity flow problems by a pressure stabilized characteristic-curve finite element scheme
- MI2008-5 Yoshiyasu OZEKI  
Torsion points of abelian varieties with values in infinite extensions over a p-adic field
- MI2008-6 Yoshiyuki TOMIYAMA  
Lifting Galois representations over arbitrary number fields
- MI2008-7 Takehiro HIROTSU & Setsuo TANIGUCHI  
The random walk model revisited
- MI2008-8 Silvia GANDY, Masaaki KANNO, Hirokazu ANAI & Kazuhiro YOKOYAMA  
Optimizing a particular real root of a polynomial by a special cylindrical algebraic decomposition
- MI2008-9 Kazufumi KIMOTO, Sho MATSUMOTO & Masato WAKAYAMA  
Alpha-determinant cyclic modules and Jacobi polynomials
- MI2008-10 Sangyeol LEE & Hiroki MASUDA  
Jarque-Bera Normality Test for the Driving Lévy Process of a Discretely Observed Univariate SDE
- MI2008-11 Hiroyuki CHIHARA & Eiji ONODERA  
A third order dispersive flow for closed curves into almost Hermitian manifolds
- MI2008-12 Takehiko KINOSHITA, Kouji HASHIMOTO and Mitsuhiro T. NAKAO  
On the  $L^2$  a priori error estimates to the finite element solution of elliptic problems with singular adjoint operator
- MI2008-13 Jacques FARAUT and Masato WAKAYAMA  
Hermitian symmetric spaces of tube type and multivariate Meixner-Pollaczek polynomials

- MI2008-14 Takashi NAKAMURA  
Riemann zeta-values, Euler polynomials and the best constant of Sobolev inequality
- MI2008-15 Takashi NAKAMURA  
Some topics related to Hurwitz-Lerch zeta functions
- MI2009-1 Yasuhide FUKUMOTO  
Global time evolution of viscous vortex rings
- MI2009-2 Hidetoshi MATSUI & Sadanori KONISHI  
Regularized functional regression modeling for functional response and predictors
- MI2009-3 Hidetoshi MATSUI & Sadanori KONISHI  
Variable selection for functional regression model via the  $L_1$  regularization
- MI2009-4 Shuichi KAWANO & Sadanori KONISHI  
Nonlinear logistic discrimination via regularized Gaussian basis expansions
- MI2009-5 Toshiro HIRANOUCI & Yuichiro TAGUCHI  
Flat modules and Groebner bases over truncated discrete valuation rings
- MI2009-6 Kenji KAJIWARA & Yasuhiro OHTA  
Bilinearization and Casorati determinant solutions to non-autonomous 1+1 dimensional discrete soliton equations
- MI2009-7 Yoshiyuki KAGEI  
Asymptotic behavior of solutions of the compressible Navier-Stokes equation around the plane Couette flow
- MI2009-8 Shohei TATEISHI, Hidetoshi MATSUI & Sadanori KONISHI  
Nonlinear regression modeling via the lasso-type regularization
- MI2009-9 Takeshi TAKAISHI & Masato KIMURA  
Phase field model for mode III crack growth in two dimensional elasticity
- MI2009-10 Shingo SAITO  
Generalisation of Mack's formula for claims reserving with arbitrary exponents for the variance assumption
- MI2009-11 Kenji KAJIWARA, Masanobu KANEKO, Atsushi NOBE & Teruhisa TSUDA  
Ultradiscretization of a solvable two-dimensional chaotic map associated with the Hesse cubic curve
- MI2009-12 Tetsu MASUDA  
Hypergeometric  $\tau$ -functions of the q-Painlevé system of type  $E_8^{(1)}$
- MI2009-13 Hidenao IWANE, Hitoshi YANAMI, Hirokazu ANAI & Kazuhiro YOKOYAMA  
A Practical Implementation of a Symbolic-Numeric Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition for Quantifier Elimination
- MI2009-14 Yasunori MAEKAWA  
On Gaussian decay estimates of solutions to some linear elliptic equations and its applications

- MI2009-15 Yuya ISHIHARA & Yoshiyuki KAGEI  
Large time behavior of the semigroup on  $L^p$  spaces associated with the linearized compressible Navier-Stokes equation in a cylindrical domain
- MI2009-16 Chikashi ARITA, Atsuo KUNIBA, Kazumitsu SAKAI & Tsuyoshi SAWABE  
Spectrum in multi-species asymmetric simple exclusion process on a ring
- MI2009-17 Masato WAKAYAMA & Keitaro YAMAMOTO  
Non-linear algebraic differential equations satisfied by certain family of elliptic functions
- MI2009-18 Me Me NAING & Yasuhide FUKUMOTO  
Local Instability of an Elliptical Flow Subjected to a Coriolis Force
- MI2009-19 Mitsunori KAYANO & Sadanori KONISHI  
Sparse functional principal component analysis via regularized basis expansions and its application
- MI2009-20 Shuichi KAWANO & Sadanori KONISHI  
Semi-supervised logistic discrimination via regularized Gaussian basis expansions
- MI2009-21 Hiroshi YOSHIDA, Yoshihiro MIWA & Masanobu KANEKO  
Elliptic curves and Fibonacci numbers arising from Lindenmayer system with symbolic computations
- MI2009-22 Eiji ONODERA  
A remark on the global existence of a third order dispersive flow into locally Hermitian symmetric spaces
- MI2009-23 Stjepan LUGOMER & Yasuhide FUKUMOTO  
Generation of ribbons, helicoids and complex scherk surface in laser-matter Interactions
- MI2009-24 Yu KAWAKAMI  
Recent progress in value distribution of the hyperbolic Gauss map
- MI2009-25 Takehiko KINOSHITA & Mitsuhiro T. NAKAO  
On very accurate enclosure of the optimal constant in the a priori error estimates for  $H_0^2$ -projection
- MI2009-26 Manabu YOSHIDA  
Ramification of local fields and Fontaine's property (Pm)
- MI2009-27 Yu KAWAKAMI  
Value distribution of the hyperbolic Gauss maps for flat fronts in hyperbolic three-space
- MI2009-28 Masahisa TABATA  
Numerical simulation of fluid movement in an hourglass by an energy-stable finite element scheme
- MI2009-29 Yoshiyuki KAGEI & Yasunori MAEKAWA  
Asymptotic behaviors of solutions to evolution equations in the presence of translation and scaling invariance

- MI2009-30 Yoshiyuki KAGEI & Yasunori MAEKAWA  
On asymptotic behaviors of solutions to parabolic systems modelling chemotaxis
- MI2009-31 Masato WAKAYAMA & Yoshinori YAMASAKI  
Hecke's zeros and higher depth determinants
- MI2009-32 Olivier PIRONNEAU & Masahisa TABATA  
Stability and convergence of a Galerkin-characteristics finite element scheme of lumped mass type
- MI2009-33 Chikashi ARITA  
Queueing process with excluded-volume effect
- MI2009-34 Kenji KAJIWARA, Nobutaka NAKAZONO & Teruhisa TSUDA  
Projective reduction of the discrete Painlevé system of type  $(A_2 + A_1)^{(1)}$
- MI2009-35 Yosuke MIZUYAMA, Takamasa SHINDE, Masahisa TABATA & Daisuke TAGAMI  
Finite element computation for scattering problems of micro-hologram using DtN map
- MI2009-36 Reiichiro KAWAI & Hiroki MASUDA  
Exact simulation of finite variation tempered stable Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes
- MI2009-37 Hiroki MASUDA  
On statistical aspects in calibrating a geometric skewed stable asset price model
- MI2010-1 Hiroki MASUDA  
Approximate self-weighted LAD estimation of discretely observed ergodic Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes
- MI2010-2 Reiichiro KAWAI & Hiroki MASUDA  
Infinite variation tempered stable Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes with discrete observations
- MI2010-3 Kei HIROSE, Shuichi KAWANO, Daisuke MIIKE & Sadanori KONISHI  
Hyper-parameter selection in Bayesian structural equation models
- MI2010-4 Nobuyuki IKEDA & Setsuo TANIGUCHI  
The Itô-Nisio theorem, quadratic Wiener functionals, and 1-solitons
- MI2010-5 Shohei TATEISHI & Sadanori KONISHI  
Nonlinear regression modeling and detecting change point via the relevance vector machine
- MI2010-6 Shuichi KAWANO, Toshihiro MISUMI & Sadanori KONISHI  
Semi-supervised logistic discrimination via graph-based regularization
- MI2010-7 Teruhisa TSUDA  
UC hierarchy and monodromy preserving deformation
- MI2010-8 Takahiro ITO  
Abstract collision systems on groups

- MI2010-9 Hiroshi YOSHIDA, Kinji KIMURA, Naoki YOSHIDA, Junko TANAKA & Yoshihiro MIWA  
An algebraic approach to underdetermined experiments
- MI2010-10 Kei HIROSE & Sadanori KONISHI  
Variable selection via the grouped weighted lasso for factor analysis models
- MI2010-11 Katsusuke NABESHIMA & Hiroshi YOSHIDA  
Derivation of specific conditions with Comprehensive Groebner Systems
- MI2010-12 Yoshiyuki KAGEI, Yu NAGAFUCHI & Takeshi SUDOU  
Decay estimates on solutions of the linearized compressible Navier-Stokes equation around a Poiseuille type flow
- MI2010-13 Reiichiro KAWAI & Hiroki MASUDA  
On simulation of tempered stable random variates
- MI2010-14 Yoshiyasu OZEKI  
Non-existence of certain Galois representations with a uniform tame inertia weight
- MI2010-15 Me Me NAING & Yasuhide FUKUMOTO  
Local Instability of a Rotating Flow Driven by Precession of Arbitrary Frequency
- MI2010-16 Yu KAWAKAMI & Daisuke NAKAJO  
The value distribution of the Gauss map of improper affine spheres
- MI2010-17 Kazunori YASUTAKE  
On the classification of rank 2 almost Fano bundles on projective space
- MI2010-18 Toshimitsu TAKAESU  
Scaling limits for the system of semi-relativistic particles coupled to a scalar bose field
- MI2010-19 Reiichiro KAWAI & Hiroki MASUDA  
Local asymptotic normality for normal inverse Gaussian Lévy processes with high-frequency sampling
- MI2010-20 Yasuhide FUKUMOTO, Makoto HIROTA & Youichi MIE  
Lagrangian approach to weakly nonlinear stability of an elliptical flow
- MI2010-21 Hiroki MASUDA  
Approximate quadratic estimating function for discretely observed Lévy driven SDEs with application to a noise normality test
- MI2010-22 Toshimitsu TAKAESU  
A Generalized Scaling Limit and its Application to the Semi-Relativistic Particles System Coupled to a Bose Field with Removing Ultraviolet Cutoffs
- MI2010-23 Takahiro ITO, Mitsuhiro FUJIO, Shuichi INOKUCHI & Yoshihiro MIZOGUCHI  
Composition, union and division of cellular automata on groups
- MI2010-24 Toshimitsu TAKAESU  
A Hardy's Uncertainty Principle Lemma in Weak Commutation Relations of Heisenberg-Lie Algebra

- MI2010-25 Toshimitsu TAKAESU  
On the Essential Self-Adjointness of Anti-Commutative Operators
- MI2010-26 Reiichiro KAWAI & Hiroki MASUDA  
On the local asymptotic behavior of the likelihood function for Meixner Lévy processes under high-frequency sampling
- MI2010-27 Chikashi ARITA & Daichi YANAGISAWA  
Exclusive Queueing Process with Discrete Time
- MI2010-28 Jun-ichi INOGUCHI, Kenji KAJIWARA, Nozomu MATSUURA & Yasuhiro OHTA  
Motion and Bäcklund transformations of discrete plane curves
- MI2010-29 Takanori YASUDA, Masaya YASUDA, Takeshi SHIMOYAMA & Jun KOGURE  
On the Number of the Pairing-friendly Curves
- MI2010-30 Chikashi ARITA & Kohei MOTEGI  
Spin-spin correlation functions of the  $q$ -VBS state of an integer spin model
- MI2010-31 Shohei TATEISHI & Sadanori KONISHI  
Nonlinear regression modeling and spike detection via Gaussian basis expansions
- MI2010-32 Nobutaka NAKAZONO  
Hypergeometric  $\tau$  functions of the  $q$ -Painlevé systems of type  $(A_2 + A_1)^{(1)}$
- MI2010-33 Yoshiyuki KAGEI  
Global existence of solutions to the compressible Navier-Stokes equation around parallel flows
- MI2010-34 Nobushige KUROKAWA, Masato WAKAYAMA & Yoshinori YAMASAKI  
Milnor-Selberg zeta functions and zeta regularizations
- MI2010-35 Kissani PERERA & Yoshihiro MIZOGUCHI  
Laplacian energy of directed graphs and minimizing maximum outdegree algorithms
- MI2010-36 Takanori YASUDA  
CAP representations of inner forms of  $Sp(4)$  with respect to Klingen parabolic subgroup
- MI2010-37 Chikashi ARITA & Andreas SCHADSCHNEIDER  
Dynamical analysis of the exclusive queueing process
- MI2011-1 Yasuhide FUKUMOTO & Alexander B. SAMOKHIN  
Singular electromagnetic modes in an anisotropic medium
- MI2011-2 Hiroki KONDO, Shingo SAITO & Setsuo TANIGUCHI  
Asymptotic tail dependence of the normal copula
- MI2011-3 Takehiro HIROTSU, Hiroki KONDO, Shingo SAITO, Takuya SATO, Tatsushi TANAKA & Setsuo TANIGUCHI  
Anderson-Darling test and the Malliavin calculus
- MI2011-4 Hiroshi INOUE, Shohei TATEISHI & Sadanori KONISHI  
Nonlinear regression modeling via Compressed Sensing

- MI2011-5 Hiroshi INOUE  
Implications in Compressed Sensing and the Restricted Isometry Property
- MI2011-6 Daeju KIM & Sadanori KONISHI  
Predictive information criterion for nonlinear regression model based on basis expansion methods
- MI2011-7 Shohei TATEISHI, Chiaki KINJYO & Sadanori KONISHI  
Group variable selection via relevance vector machine
- MI2011-8 Jan BREZINA & Yoshiyuki KAGEI  
Decay properties of solutions to the linearized compressible Navier-Stokes equation around time-periodic parallel flow  
Group variable selection via relevance vector machine
- MI2011-9 Chikashi ARITA, Arvind AYYER, Kirone MALLICK & Sylvain PROLHAC  
Recursive structures in the multispecies TASEP
- MI2011-10 Kazunori YASUTAKE  
On projective space bundle with nef normalized tautological line bundle
- MI2011-11 Hisashi ANDO, Mike HAY, Kenji KAJIWARA & Tetsu MASUDA  
An explicit formula for the discrete power function associated with circle patterns of Schramm type
- MI2011-12 Yoshiyuki KAGEI  
Asymptotic behavior of solutions to the compressible Navier-Stokes equation around a parallel flow
- MI2011-13 Vladimír CHALUPECKÝ & Adrian MUNTEAN  
Semi-discrete finite difference multiscale scheme for a concrete corrosion model: approximation estimates and convergence
- MI2011-14 Jun-ichi INOGUCHI, Kenji KAJIWARA, Nozomu MATSUURA & Yasuhiro OHTA  
Explicit solutions to the semi-discrete modified KdV equation and motion of discrete plane curves
- MI2011-15 Hiroshi INOUE  
A generalization of restricted isometry property and applications to compressed sensing
- MI2011-16 Yu KAWAKAMI  
A ramification theorem for the ratio of canonical forms of flat surfaces in hyperbolic three-space
- MI2011-17 Naoyuki KAMIYAMA  
Matroid intersection with priority constraints
- MI2012-1 Kazufumi KIMOTO & Masato WAKAYAMA  
Spectrum of non-commutative harmonic oscillators and residual modular forms
- MI2012-2 Hiroki MASUDA  
Mighty convergence of the Gaussian quasi-likelihood random fields for ergodic Levy driven SDE observed at high frequency



- MI2012-3 Hiroshi INOUE  
A Weak RIP of theory of compressed sensing and LASSO
- MI2012-4 Yasuhide FUKUMOTO & Youich MIE  
Hamiltonian bifurcation theory for a rotating flow subject to elliptic straining field
- MI2012-5 Yu KAWAKAMI  
On the maximal number of exceptional values of Gauss maps for various classes of surfaces
- MI2012-6 Marcio GAMEIRO, Yasuaki HIRAOKA, Shunsuke IZUMI, Miroslav KRAMAR, Konstantin MISCHAIKOW & Vít NANDA  
Topological Measurement of Protein Compressibility via Persistence Diagrams
- MI2012-7 Nobutaka NAKAZONO & Seiji NISHIOKA  
Solutions to a  $q$ -analog of Painlevé III equation of type  $D_7^{(1)}$
- MI2012-8 Naoyuki KAMIYAMA  
A new approach to the Pareto stable matching problem
- MI2012-9 Jan BREZINA & Yoshiyuki KAGEI  
Spectral properties of the linearized compressible Navier-Stokes equation around time-periodic parallel flow
- MI2012-10 Jan BREZINA  
Asymptotic behavior of solutions to the compressible Navier-Stokes equation around a time-periodic parallel flow
- MI2012-11 Daeju KIM, Shuichi KAWANO & Yoshiyuki NINOMIYA  
Adaptive basis expansion via the extended fused lasso
- MI2012-12 Masato WAKAYAMA  
On simplicity of the lowest eigenvalue of non-commutative harmonic oscillators
- MI2012-13 Masatoshi OKITA  
On the convergence rates for the compressible Navier- Stokes equations with potential force
- MI2013-1 Abuduwaili PAERHATI & Yasuhide FUKUMOTO  
A Counter-example to Thomson-Tait-Chetayev's Theorem
- MI2013-2 Yasuhide FUKUMOTO & Hirofumi SAKUMA  
A unified view of topological invariants of barotropic and baroclinic fluids and their application to formal stability analysis of three-dimensional ideal gas flows
- MI2013-3 Hiroki MASUDA  
Asymptotics for functionals of self-normalized residuals of discretely observed stochastic processes
- MI2013-4 Naoyuki KAMIYAMA  
On Counting Output Patterns of Logic Circuits
- MI2013-5 Hiroshi INOUE  
RIPless Theory for Compressed Sensing

- MI2013-6 Hiroshi INOUE  
Improved bounds on Restricted isometry for compressed sensing
- MI2013-7 Hidetoshi MATSUI  
Variable and boundary selection for functional data via multiclass logistic regression modeling
- MI2013-8 Hidetoshi MATSUI  
Variable selection for varying coefficient models with the sparse regularization
- MI2013-9 Naoyuki KAMIYAMA  
Packing Arborescences in Acyclic Temporal Networks
- MI2013-10 Masato WAKAYAMA  
Equivalence between the eigenvalue problem of non-commutative harmonic oscillators and existence of holomorphic solutions of Heun's differential equations, eigenstates degeneration, and Rabi's model
- MI2013-11 Masatoshi OKITA  
Optimal decay rate for strong solutions in critical spaces to the compressible Navier-Stokes equations
- MI2013-12 Shuichi KAWANO, Ibuki HOSHINA, Kazuki MATSUDA & Sadanori KONISHI  
Predictive model selection criteria for Bayesian lasso
- MI2013-13 Hayato CHIBA  
The First Painleve Equation on the Weighted Projective Space
- MI2013-14 Hidetoshi MATSUI  
Variable selection for functional linear models with functional predictors and a functional response
- MI2013-15 Naoyuki KAMIYAMA  
The Fault-Tolerant Facility Location Problem with Submodular Penalties