

# ERRATA AND SIMPLIFICATION FOR HOCHBAUM AND RAO OR 2019

DORIT S. HOCHBAUM\* AND XU RAO†

**Abstract.** The purpose of this write-up is to correct an error in a lower bound used in [1], and to show that the corrections required do not affect the results. Another part of this write-up is a simplification and streamlining of the Fully Polynomial Time Approximation Scheme result in the paper.

**1. Correcting an error.** We recently found an error in the proof of Theorem 6 in [1]. This part of the write-up specifies the modifications required to address this error. The error is that the lower bound of the optimal value  $V^*$  was written incorrectly as  $\frac{k+1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n s_i = \frac{k(k+1)}{2} D$  where it should have been  $\frac{k+1}{2k} \sum_{i=1}^n s_i = \frac{k+1}{2} D$ . This error affects Algorithm 3, which is an  $\epsilon$ -approximation algorithm. In order to correct it we change the scaling factor in Step 1 of Algorithm 3 from  $\epsilon^2 D$  to  $\frac{\epsilon^2 D}{k}$ . The running time of Algorithm 3 with this adjusted scaling factor is still  $O(\frac{n}{\epsilon^{2k}})$  for constant  $k$ . Hence, the results of the paper do not change. As an aside, we note that this running time is in fact fixed-parameter tractable for the parameter  $k$ .

We now list the changes in lemmas and formulas in Section 4.2 of [1] needed as a result of the modification of the scaling factor:

1. The right hand side of the  $\epsilon$ -relaxed cascading constraints in ( $\epsilon$ -relaxed RSP) should be changed from  $\ell D + \epsilon k D$  to  $\ell D + \epsilon D$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$ .
2. In Lemma 6, the bound should be changed from  $V_k(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon k D$  to  $V_k(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon D$ .
3. In Theorem 2, the inequalities should be changed from

$$\epsilon^2 D g'(\mathbf{x}^L) - \frac{k^2(k+1)D}{2} \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon} \leq g(\mathbf{x}^L) \leq \epsilon^2 D g'(\mathbf{x}^L) + \frac{k(k+1)(k+2)D}{6} \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}$$

to

$$\frac{\epsilon^2 D}{k} g'(\mathbf{x}^L) - \frac{k(k+1)D}{2} \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon} \leq g(\mathbf{x}^L) \leq \frac{\epsilon^2 D}{k} g'(\mathbf{x}^L) + \frac{(k+1)(k+2)D}{6} \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}.$$

4. The value of  $\delta(\epsilon)$ , which appears in Theorem 3, Corollary 1, Theorem 5 and Theorem 6, should be changed from  $\delta(\epsilon) = \frac{k(k+1)(2k+1)D}{3} \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}$  to  $\delta(\epsilon) = \frac{(k+1)(2k+1)D}{3} \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}$ .

Finally, with the updated value  $\delta(\epsilon)$  and Lemma 6, in the proof of Theorem 6 the inequality  $V(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \leq V^* + \frac{\delta(\epsilon)}{k} + \epsilon k D$  should be changed to  $V(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \leq V^* + \frac{\delta(\epsilon)}{k} + \epsilon D$ . Observe that the new  $\delta(\epsilon)$  is  $1/k$  times the original value, and the new second additional term  $\epsilon D$  is  $1/k$  times the original one,  $\epsilon k D$ . Hence, using the corrected lower bound of  $V^*$ , which is also  $1/k$  times the one that was used, we get the same bound for the ratio  $V(\hat{\mathbf{x}})/V^*$ . Therefore, Theorem 6 holds with the correction and the modified scaling factor.

**2. A simplification for proving the approximation bound.** We present here a streamlined version of Theorem 2, resulting in simplified inequalities and formulas in several lemmas and theorems.

We provide next the new version of Theorem 2 and its proof.

**THEOREM 2.1.** *For any assignment of large items  $\mathbf{x}^L$  feasible for (scaled-modified- $k$ -RSP<sub>1</sub>), the values of the objective function with original and scaled sizes,  $g(\mathbf{x}^L)$  and  $g'(\mathbf{x}^L)$  respectively, satisfy,*

$$\frac{\epsilon^2 D}{k} \cdot g'(\mathbf{x}^L) - \epsilon k^2 D \leq g(\mathbf{x}^L) \leq \frac{\epsilon^2 D}{k} \cdot g'(\mathbf{x}^L) + \epsilon k^2 D.$$

*Proof.* Let  $T = \frac{\epsilon^2 D}{k}$  denote the scaling factor. Recall that  $s'_i = \lfloor \frac{s_i}{T} \rfloor$ , so  $T s'_i \leq s_i < T(s'_i + 1)$ . So for any integer time  $j$ ,

$$Q_j(\mathbf{x}^L) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_L} s_i x_{ij}^L < T \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n_L} (s'_i + 1) x_{ij}^L = T \cdot \left( Q'_j(\mathbf{x}^L) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_L} x_{ij}^L \right)$$

\*Department of IEOR, Etcheverry Hall, Berkeley, CA. (hochbaum@ieor.berkeley.edu).

†Department of IEOR, Etcheverry Hall, Berkeley, CA. (xrao@berkeley.edu).

The second term in the parentheses,  $\sum_{i=1}^{n_L} x_{ij}^L$ , must be less than or equal to the number of large items, which is bounded by  $\frac{k}{\epsilon}$ . Therefore we derive the following inequality

$$(2.1) \quad Q_j(\mathbf{x}^L) < T \cdot \left( Q'_j(\mathbf{x}^L) + \frac{k}{\epsilon} \right) = T \cdot Q'_j(\mathbf{x}^L) + \epsilon D \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k.$$

Using  $s_i \geq T s'_i$  for any  $i$ , we get

$$(2.2) \quad Q_j(\mathbf{x}^L) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_L} s_i x_{ij}^L \geq T \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n_L} s'_i x_{ij}^L = T \cdot Q'_j(\mathbf{x}^L) \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, k.$$

Recall that the adjusted remainder of time  $\tau$  is  $\bar{R}_\tau(\mathbf{x}^L) = \min_{\ell \geq \tau} R_\ell = \min_{\ell \geq \tau} \left( \ell D - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} Q_j(\mathbf{x}^L) \right)$ , and that the scaled adjusted remainder of time  $\tau$  is  $\bar{R}'_\tau(\mathbf{x}^L) = \min_{\ell \geq \tau} \left( \ell D' - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} Q'_j(\mathbf{x}^L) \right)$ . We derive from inequality (2.1) that for any time  $\tau$ ,

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{R}_\tau(\mathbf{x}^L) &= \min_{\ell \geq \tau} \left( \ell D - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} Q_j(\mathbf{x}^L) \right) \\ &\geq \min_{\ell \geq \tau} \left[ \ell D - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} (T \cdot Q'_j(\mathbf{x}^L) + \epsilon D) \right] \\ &\geq \min_{\ell \geq \tau} \left[ \ell D - T \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} Q'_j(\mathbf{x}^L) \right] - \epsilon k D \\ &= T \cdot \bar{R}'_\tau(\mathbf{x}^L) - \epsilon k D. \end{aligned}$$

And we derive from inequality (2.2) that for any time  $\tau$ ,

$$(2.4) \quad \bar{R}_\tau(\mathbf{x}^L) = \min_{\ell \geq \tau} \left( \ell D - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} Q_j(\mathbf{x}^L) \right) \leq \min_{\ell \geq \tau} \left( \ell D - T \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} Q'_j(\mathbf{x}^L) \right) = T \cdot \bar{R}'_\tau(\mathbf{x}^L)$$

Using the inequalities (2.1) and (2.4), we prove the upper bound on  $g(\mathbf{x}^L)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} g(\mathbf{x}^L) &= \sum_{j=1}^k (k-j+1) Q_j(\mathbf{x}^L) + \sum_{\tau=1}^k \bar{R}_\tau(\mathbf{x}^L) \\ &< \sum_{j=1}^k (k-j+1) (T \cdot Q'_j(\mathbf{x}^L) + \epsilon D) + \sum_{\tau=1}^k T \cdot \bar{R}'_\tau(\mathbf{x}^L) \\ &= T \cdot \left[ \sum_{j=1}^k (k-j+1) Q'_j(\mathbf{x}^L) + \sum_{\tau=1}^k \bar{R}'_\tau(\mathbf{x}^L) \right] + \epsilon D \cdot \sum_{j=1}^k (k-j+1) \\ &\leq T \cdot g'(\mathbf{x}^L) + \epsilon k^2 D. \end{aligned}$$

The lower bound on  $g(\mathbf{x}^L)$  follows from inequalities (2.2) and (2.3):

$$\begin{aligned}
g(\mathbf{x}^L) &= \sum_{j=1}^k (k-j+1)Q_j(\mathbf{x}^L) + \sum_{\tau=1}^k \bar{R}_\tau(\mathbf{x}^L) \\
&\geq \sum_{j=1}^k (k-j+1)T \cdot Q'_j(\mathbf{x}^L) + \sum_{\tau=1}^k (T \cdot \bar{R}'_\tau(\mathbf{x}^L) - \epsilon k D) \\
&= T \cdot \left[ \sum_{j=1}^k (k-j+1)Q'_j(\mathbf{x}^L) + \sum_{\tau=1}^k \bar{R}'_\tau(\mathbf{x}^L) \right] - \epsilon k^2 D \\
&= T \cdot g'(\mathbf{x}^L) - \epsilon k^2 D.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the statement of the theorem.  $\square$

Using these new inequalities, the value of  $\delta(\epsilon)$ , which appears in Theorem 3, Corollary 1, Theorem 5 and Theorem 6, should be changed to  $\delta(\epsilon) = 2\epsilon k^2 D$  accordingly. Additionally, we derive in Theorem 6 an upper bound of the ratio  $V(\hat{\mathbf{x}})/V^*$  as  $1 + \left(\frac{\delta(\epsilon)}{k} + \epsilon D\right)/V^*$ . With the new expression of  $\delta(\epsilon)$ , we can show that:

$$\left(\frac{\delta(\epsilon)}{k} + \epsilon D\right)/V^* \leq (2k+1)\epsilon D \cdot \frac{2}{(k+1)D} \leq 4\epsilon.$$

Therefore, the ratio  $V(\hat{\mathbf{x}})/V^*$  is at most  $1 + 4\epsilon = 1 + \epsilon'$  for  $\epsilon' = 4\epsilon$ .

#### REFERENCES

- [1] D. S. Hochbaum and X. Rao, The replenishment schedule to minimize peak storage problem: The gap between the continuous and discrete versions of the problem, *Operations Research*, 67 (2019), pp. 13451361.