

# Packing a Knapsack of Unknown Capacity

Yann Disser\*, Max Klimm, Nicole Megow† and Sebastian Stiller

Department of Mathematics, Technische Universität Berlin, Germany.  
`{disser,klimm,nmegow,stiller}@math.tu-berlin.de`.

August 1, 2018

## Abstract

We study the problem of packing a knapsack without knowing its capacity. Whenever we attempt to pack an item that does not fit, the item is discarded; if the item fits, we have to include it in the packing. We show that there is always a policy that packs a value within factor 2 of the optimum packing, irrespective of the actual capacity. If all items have unit density, we achieve a factor equal to the golden ratio  $\varphi \approx 1.618$ . Both factors are shown to be best possible.

In fact, we obtain the above factors using packing policies that are *universal* in the sense that they fix a particular order of the items and try to pack the items in this order, independent of the observations made while packing. We give efficient algorithms computing these policies. On the other hand, we show that, for any  $\alpha > 1$ , the problem of deciding whether a given universal policy achieves a factor of  $\alpha$  is **coNP**-complete. If  $\alpha$  is part of the input, the same problem is shown to be **coNP**-complete for items with unit densities. Finally, we show that it is **coNP**-hard to decide, for given  $\alpha$ , whether a set of items admits a universal policy with factor  $\alpha$ , even if all items have unit densities.

## 1 Introduction

In the standard knapsack problem we are given a set of items, each associated with a size and a value, and a capacity of the knapsack. The goal is to find a subset of the items with maximum value whose size does not exceed the capacity. In this paper, we study the *oblivious* knapsack problem where the capacity of the knapsack is not given. Whenever we try to pack an item, we observe whether or not it fits the knapsack. If it does, the item is packed into the knapsack and cannot be removed later. If it does not fit, we discard it and continue packing with the remaining items. The central question of this paper is how much we lose by not knowing the capacity, in the worst case. The oblivious variant of the knapsack problem naturally arises whenever items are prioritized by a different entity or at a different time than the actual packing of the knapsack.

A solution to the oblivious knapsack problem is a policy that governs the order in which we attempt to pack the items, depending only on the observation which of the previously attempted items did fit into the knapsack and which did not. In other words, a policy is a binary decision tree with the item that is tried first at its root. The two children of the root are the items that are tried next, which of the two depends on whether or not the first item fits the knapsack, and so

---

\*Supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

†Supported by the German Science Foundation (DFG) under contract ME 3825/1.

on. We aim for a solution that is good for *every* possible capacity, compared to the best solution of the standard knapsack problem for this capacity. Formally, a policy has *robustness factor*  $\alpha$  if, for any capacity, packing according to the policy results in a value that is at least a  $1/\alpha$ -fraction of the optimum value for this capacity.

We show that the oblivious knapsack problem always admits a robustness factor of 2. In fact, this robustness factor can be achieved with a policy that packs the items according to a fixed order, irrespective of the observations made while packing. Such a policy is called *universal*. We provide an algorithm that computes a 2-robust, universal policy in time  $\Theta(n \log n)$  for a given set of  $n$  items. We complement this result by showing that no robustness factor better than 2 can be achieved in general, even by policies that are not universal. In other words, the cost of not knowing the capacity is exactly 2.

We give a different efficient algorithm for the case that all items have unit density, i.e., size and value of each item coincide. This algorithm produces a universal policy with a robustness factor of at most the golden ratio  $\varphi \approx 1.618$ . Again, we show that no better robustness factor can be achieved in general, even by policies that are not universal.

While good universal policies can be found efficiently, it is intractable to compute the robustness factor of a *given* universal policy and it is intractable to compute the best robustness factor an instance admits. Specifically, we show that, for any fixed  $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$ , it is **coNP**-complete to decide whether a given universal policy is  $\alpha$ -robust. For unit densities we establish a slightly weaker hardness result by showing that it is **coNP**-complete to decide whether a given universal policy achieves a *given* robustness factor  $\alpha$ . Finally, we show that, for given  $\alpha$ , it is **coNP**-hard to decide whether an instance of the oblivious knapsack problem admits a universal policy with robustness factor  $\alpha$ , even when all items have unit density.

## Related work

The knapsack problem has been studied for different models of imperfect information. In the *stochastic* knapsack problem, sizes and values of the items are random variables. It is known that a policy maximizing the expected value is **PSPACE**-hard to compute, see Dean et al. [7]. The authors assume that the packing stops when the first item does not fit the knapsack, and give a universal policy that approximates the value obtained by an optimal, not necessarily universal, policy by a factor of 2. They also provide a non-universal policy within a factor of  $3 + \varepsilon$  of the optimal policy. Bhalgat et al. [3] give an algorithm with an improved approximation guarantee of  $8/3 + \varepsilon$ . They also give a PTAS for the case that it is allowed to violate the capacity of the knapsack by a factor of  $1 + \varepsilon$ .

In *robust* knapsack problems, a set of possible scenarios for the sizes and values of the items is given. Yu [24], Bertsimas and Sim [2], Goetzmann et al. [12], and Monaci and Pferschy [19] study the problem of maximizing the worst-case value of a knapsack under various models. Büsing et al. [5] and Bouman et al. [4] study the problem from a computational point of view. Both allow for an adjustment of the solution after the realization of the scenario. Similar to our model, Bouman et al. consider uncertainty in the capacity.

The notion of a *robustness factor* that we adopt in this work is due to Hassin and Rubinstein [13] and is defined as the worst-case ratio of solution and optimum, over all realizations. Kakimura et al. [15] analyze the complexity of deciding whether an  $\alpha$ -robust solution exists for a knapsack instance with an unknown bound on the number of items that can be packed. Megow and Mestre [17] study a variant of the knapsack problem with unknown capacity closely related to ours. In contrast to our model, they assume that the packing stops once the first item does not fit the remaining capacity. In this model, a universal policy with a constant robustness factor may fail

to exist, and, thus, Megow and Mestre resort to *instance-sensitive* performance guarantees. They provide a PTAS that constructs a universal policy with robustness factor arbitrarily close to the best possible robustness factor for every particular instance.

The concept of *obliviousness* is used in various other contexts (explicitly or implicitly), such as hashing (Carter and Wegman [6]), caching (Frigo et al. [10], Bender et al. [1]) routing (Valiant and Brebner [23], Räcke [21]), TSP (Papadimitriou [20], Deineko et al. [8], Jia et al. [14]), Steiner tree and set cover (Jia et al. [14]), and scheduling (Epstein et al. [9], Megow and Mestre [17]). In all of these works, the general idea is that specific parameters of a problem instance are unknown, e.g., the cache size or the set of vertices to visit in a TSP tour, and the goal is to find a *universal solution* that performs well for all realizations of the hidden parameters.

Universal policies for the oblivious knapsack problem play a role in the design of public key cryptosystems. One of the first such systems – the Merkle–Hellman knapsack cryptosystem [18] – is based on particular instances that allow for a 1-robust universal policy for the oblivious knapsack problem. The basic version of this cryptosystem can be attacked efficiently, e.g., by the famous attack of Shamir [22]. This attack uses the fact that the underlying knapsack instance has exponentially increasing item sizes. A better understanding of universal policies may help to develop knapsack-based cryptosystems that avoid the weaknesses of Merkle and Hellman’s.

## 2 Preliminaries

An instance of the *oblivious knapsack problem* is given by a set of  $n$  items  $\mathcal{I}$ , where each item  $i \in \mathcal{I}$  has a non-negative *value*  $v(i) \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$  and a strictly positive *size*  $l(i) \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ . For a subset  $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}$  of items, we write  $v(S) = \sum_{i \in S} v(i)$  and  $l(S) = \sum_{i \in S} l(i)$  to denote its total value and total size, respectively, of the items in  $S$ . A *solution* for instance  $\mathcal{I}$  is a policy  $\mathcal{P}$  that governs the order in which the items are considered for packing into the knapsack. The policy must be independent of the capacity of the knapsack, but the choice which item to try next may depend on the observations which items did and which items did not fit the knapsack so far. Formally, a solution policy is a binary decision tree that contains every item exactly once along each path from the root to a leaf. The *packing*  $\mathcal{P}(C) \subseteq \mathcal{I}$  of  $\mathcal{P}$  for a fixed capacity  $C$  is obtained as follows: We start with  $\mathcal{P}(C) = \emptyset$  and check whether the item  $r$  at the root of  $\mathcal{P}$  fits the knapsack, i.e., whether  $l(r) + l(\mathcal{P}(C)) \leq C$ . If the item fits, we add  $r$  to  $\mathcal{P}(C)$  and continue packing recursively with the left subtree of  $r$ . Otherwise, we discard  $r$  and continue packing recursively with the right subtree of  $r$ .

A *universal policy*  $\Pi$  for instance  $\mathcal{I}$  is a policy that does not depend on observations made while packing, i.e., the decision tree for a universal policy has a fixed permutation of the items along every path from the root to a leaf. We identify a universal policy with this fixed permutation and write  $\Pi = (\Pi_1, \Pi_2, \dots, \Pi_n)$ . Analogously to general policies, the packing  $\Pi(C) \subseteq \mathcal{I}$  of a universal policy  $\Pi$  for capacity  $C \leq l(\mathcal{I})$  is obtained by considering the items in the order given by the permutation  $\Pi$  and adding every item if it does not exceed the remaining capacity.

We measure the quality of a policy for the oblivious knapsack problem by comparing its packing with the optimal packing for each capacity. More precisely, a policy  $\mathcal{P}$  for instance  $\mathcal{I}$  is called  $\alpha$ -*robust for capacity*  $C$ ,  $\alpha \geq 1$ , if it holds that  $v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C)) \leq \alpha \cdot v(\mathcal{P}(C))$ , where  $\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C)$  denotes an optimal packing for capacity  $C$ . We say  $\mathcal{P}$  is  $\alpha$ -*robust* if it is  $\alpha$ -robust for all capacities. In this case, we call  $\alpha$  the *robustness factor* of policy  $\mathcal{P}$ .

### 3 Solving the Oblivious Knapsack Problem

In this section, we describe an efficient algorithm that constructs a universal policy for a given instance of the oblivious knapsack problem. The solution produced by our algorithm is guaranteed to pack at least half the value of the optimal solution for any capacity  $C$ . We show that this is the best possible robustness factor.

The analysis of our algorithm relies on the classical *modified greedy* algorithm (cf. [16]). We compare the packing of our policy, for each capacity, to the packing obtained by the modified greedy algorithm instead of the actual optimum. As the modified greedy is a 2-approximation, to show that our policy is 2-robust it is sufficient to show that its packing is never worse than the one obtained by the modified greedy algorithm. We briefly review the modified greedy algorithm.

Let  $d(i) = v(i)/l(i)$  denote the *density* of item  $i$ . The modified greedy algorithm (MGREEDY) for a set of items  $\mathcal{I}$  and known knapsack capacity  $C$  first discards all items that are larger than  $C$  from  $\mathcal{I}$ . The remaining items are sorted in non-increasing order of their densities, breaking ties arbitrarily. The algorithm then either takes the longest prefix  $P$  of the resulting sequence that still fits into capacity  $C$ , or the first item  $s$  that does not fit anymore, depending on which of the two has a greater value. In the latter case, we say that  $s$  is a *swap item* (for capacity  $C$ ) that and  $C$  is a *swap capacity*. In both cases, we refer to  $P$  as the *greedy set* for capacity  $C$ . See Algorithm 1 for a formal description.

For our analysis, it is helpful to fix the tie-breaking rule of the greedy algorithm. To this end, we assume that there is a bijection  $t : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , that maps every item  $i \in \mathcal{I}$  to a *tie-breaking index*  $t(i)$ , and that the modified greedy algorithm initially sorts the items decreasingly with respect to the tuple  $\tilde{d}(\cdot) = (d(\cdot), t(\cdot))$ , i.e., the items are sorted non-increasingly by density and whenever two items have the same density, they are sorted by decreasing tie-breaking index. In the following, for two items  $i, j$ , we write  $\tilde{d}(i) \succ \tilde{d}(j)$  if and only if  $d(i) > d(j)$ , or  $d(i) = d(j)$  and  $t(i) > t(j)$ , and say that  $i$  has higher density than  $j$ .

We evaluate the quality of our universal policy by comparing it for every capacity with the solution of MGREEDY. This analysis suffices because of the following well-known property of the modified greedy algorithm.

**Theorem 1** (cf. [16]). *For every instance  $(\mathcal{I}, C)$  of the standard knapsack problem with known capacity,  $v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C)) \leq 2 \cdot v(\text{MGREEDY}(\mathcal{I}, C))$ .*

We are now ready to describe our algorithm UNIVERSAL (Algorithm 2) that produces a universal policy tailored to imitate the behavior of MGREEDY without knowing the capacity.

---

#### Algorithm 1: MGREEDY( $\mathcal{I}, C$ )

---

**Input:** set of items  $\mathcal{I}$ , capacity  $C$

**Output:** subset  $S \subseteq \mathcal{I}$  such that  $l(S) \leq C$  and  $v(S) \geq v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C))/2$

$D \leftarrow \langle \text{items in } \{i \in \mathcal{I} \mid l(i) \leq C\} \text{ sorted decreasingly by density} \rangle$

$k \leftarrow \max\{j \mid l(\{D_1, \dots, D_j\}) \leq C\}$

$P \leftarrow (D_1, \dots, D_k), s \leftarrow D_{k+1}$

**if**  $v(P) \geq v(s)$  **then**

**return**  $P$

**else**

**return**  $\{s\}$

---

---

**Algorithm 2:** UNIVERSAL( $\mathcal{I}$ )

---

**Input:** set of items  $\mathcal{I}$   
**Output:** sequence of items  $\Pi$   
 $L \leftarrow \langle \text{items in } \mathcal{I} \text{ sorted by non-decreasing size} \rangle$   
 $\Pi^{(0)} \leftarrow \emptyset$   
**for**  $r \leftarrow 1, \dots, n$  **do**  
    **if**  $L_r$  *is a swap item* **then**  
         $\Pi^{(r)} \leftarrow (L_r, \Pi^{(r-1)})$   
    **else**  
         $j \leftarrow 1$   
        **while**  $j \leq |\Pi|$  **and**  $\tilde{d}(\Pi_j) \succ \tilde{d}(L_r)$  **do**  
             $j \leftarrow j + 1$   
         $\Pi^{(r)} \leftarrow (\Pi_1^{(r-1)}, \dots, \Pi_{j-1}^{(r-1)}, L_r, \Pi_j^{(r-1)}, \dots)$   
**return**  $\Pi^{(n)}$

---

First, UNIVERSAL determines which items are swap items. It then starts with an empty permutation, and considers the items in order of non-decreasing sizes, inserting each item into the permutation. Swap items are always placed in front of all items already in the permutation, and all other items are inserted in front of the first item in the permutation that has a lower density.

We prove the following result.

**Theorem 2.** *The algorithm UNIVERSAL constructs a universal policy of robustness factor 2.*

Before we prove this theorem, we first analyze the structure of the permutation output by UNIVERSAL in terms of density, size, and value. First, we prove that every item following a non-swap item has lower density.

**Lemma 3.** *For a sequence  $\Pi$  returned by UNIVERSAL, we have  $\tilde{d}(\Pi_k) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_{k+1})$  for every non-swap item  $\Pi_k$ ,  $1 \leq k < n$ .*

*Proof.* For  $j \in \{k, k+1\}$ , let  $r(j) \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  be the index of the iteration in which UNIVERSAL inserts  $\Pi_j$  into  $\Pi$ . We distinguish two cases.

If  $r(k) < r(k+1)$ , then the item  $\Pi_{k+1}$  cannot be a swap item, since it would appear in front of the item  $\Pi_k$  if it was. As each non-swap item is inserted into  $\Pi$  such that all items left of it are larger with respect to  $\tilde{d}$ , the claim follows.

If  $r(k) > r(k+1)$ , since it is not a swap item,  $\Pi_k$  is put in front of  $\Pi_{k+1}$  because it has a higher density.  $\square$

We prove that no item preceding a swap item has smaller size.

**Lemma 4.** *For a permutation  $\Pi$  returned by UNIVERSAL, we have  $l(\Pi_j) \geq l(\Pi_k)$  for every swap item  $\Pi_k$ ,  $1 < k \leq n$ , and every other item  $\Pi_j$ ,  $1 \leq j < k$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\Pi_k$  is a swap item, it stands in front of all items inserted earlier into  $\Pi$ . Hence, all items that appear in front of  $\Pi_k$  in  $\Pi$  have been inserted in a later iteration of UNIVERSAL. Since UNIVERSAL processes items in order of non-decreasing sizes, we have  $l(\Pi_j) \geq l(\Pi_k)$ .  $\square$

We prove that no item preceding a swap item has smaller value.

**Lemma 5.** *For a permutation  $\Pi$  returned by UNIVERSAL, we have  $v(\Pi_j) \geq v(\Pi_k)$  for every swap item  $\Pi_k, 1 < k \leq n$ , and every other item  $\Pi_j, 1 \leq j < k$ .*

*Proof.* We distinguish three cases.

*First case:*  $\Pi_j$  is a swap item and  $d(\Pi_j) \geq d(\Pi_k)$ . By Lemma 4, we have  $l(\Pi_j) \geq l(\Pi_k)$ , and the claim trivially holds.

*Second case:*  $\Pi_j$  is a swap item and  $d(\Pi_j) < d(\Pi_k)$ . Since  $\Pi_j$  is a swap item, there is a capacity  $C \geq l(\Pi_j)$  such that

$$v(\Pi_j) > v(\{i \in \mathcal{I} \mid l(i) \leq C \text{ and } \tilde{d}(i) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_j)\}).$$

In particular, for  $C = l(\Pi_j)$  we obtain

$$v(\Pi_j) > v(\{i \in \mathcal{I} \mid l(i) \leq l(\Pi_j) \text{ and } \tilde{d}(i) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_j)\}). \quad (1)$$

Since, by Lemma 4,  $l(\Pi_j) \geq l(\Pi_k)$ , the item  $\Pi_k$  is included in the set on the right hand side of (1). We conclude that  $v(\Pi_j) > v(\Pi_k)$ .

*Third case:*  $\Pi_j$  is not a swap item. Let  $\Pi_{j'}$  be the first swap item after  $\Pi_j$  in  $\Pi$ , i.e.,

$$j' = \min\{i \in \{j+1, \dots, k\} \mid \Pi_i \text{ is a swap item}\}.$$

Note that the minimum is attained as  $\Pi_k$  is a swap item. The analysis of the first two cases implies that  $v(\Pi_{j'}) \geq v(\Pi_k)$ . By Lemma 3 we have  $d(\Pi_j) \geq d(\Pi_{j+1}) \geq \dots \geq d(\Pi_{j'})$ , and by Lemma 4 we have  $l(\Pi_j) \geq l(\Pi_{j'})$ . Hence,  $v(\Pi_j) \geq v(\Pi_{j'}) \geq v(\Pi_k)$ .  $\square$

Finally, the next lemma gives a legitimation for the violation of the density order in the output permutation. Essentially, whenever an item precedes denser items, we guarantee that it is worth at least as much as all of them combined.

**Lemma 6.** *For a permutation  $\Pi$  returned by UNIVERSAL, we have*

$$v(\Pi_k) \geq v(\{\Pi_j \mid j > k \text{ and } \tilde{d}(\Pi_j) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_k)\})$$

*for every item  $\Pi_k, 1 \leq k < n$ .*

*Proof.* We distinguish whether  $\Pi_k$  is a swap item, or not.

If  $\Pi_k$  is a swap item, by definition,  $\Pi_k$  is worth more than the greedy set for some capacity  $C \geq l(\Pi_k)$ . Thus,

$$v(\Pi_k) > v(\{\Pi_j \mid l(\Pi_j) \leq C \text{ and } \tilde{d}(\Pi_j) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_k)\}) \geq v(\{\Pi_j \mid l(\Pi_j) \leq l(\Pi_k) \text{ and } \tilde{d}(\Pi_j) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_k)\}).$$

Since items whose size is strictly larger than  $l(\Pi_k)$  are inserted into  $\Pi$  at a later iteration of UNIVERSAL, they can only end up behind  $\Pi_k$  if they are smaller with respect to  $\tilde{d}$ . Hence,

$$\{\Pi_j \mid j > k \text{ and } \tilde{d}(\Pi_j) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_k)\} \subseteq \{\Pi_j \mid l(\Pi_j) \leq l(\Pi_k) \text{ and } \tilde{d}(\Pi_j) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_k)\},$$

and thus  $v(\Pi_k) > v(\{\Pi_j \mid j > k \text{ and } \tilde{d}(\Pi_j) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_k)\})$ , as claimed.

If, on the other hand,  $\Pi_k$  is not a swap item, let  $\Pi_{k'}$  be the first swap item after it in  $\Pi$ . If no such item exists, the claim holds by Lemma 3, since

$$\{\Pi_j \mid j > k \text{ and } \tilde{d}(\Pi_j) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_k)\} = \emptyset.$$

Otherwise, by Lemma 3, we obtain  $\tilde{d}(\Pi_k) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_{k+1}) \succ \dots \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_{k'})$  and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \{\Pi_j \mid j > k \text{ and } \tilde{d}(\Pi_j) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_k)\} &= \{\Pi_j \mid j > k' \text{ and } \tilde{d}(\Pi_j) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_k)\} \\ &\subseteq \{\Pi_j \mid j > k' \text{ and } \tilde{d}(\Pi_j) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_{k'})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, and by the argument above for swap items,

$$\begin{aligned} v(\Pi_{k'}) &> v(\{\Pi_j \mid j > k' \text{ and } \tilde{d}(\Pi_j) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_{k'})\}) \\ &\geq v(\{\Pi_j \mid j > k \text{ and } \tilde{d}(\Pi_j) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_k)\}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by Lemma 5, we have  $v(\Pi_k) \geq v(\Pi_{k'}) \geq v(\{\Pi_j \mid j > k \text{ and } \tilde{d}(\Pi_j) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_k)\})$ .  $\square$

We now prove Theorem 2.

*of Theorem 2.* We show that for every set of items  $\mathcal{I}$ , the permutation  $\Pi = \text{UNIVERSAL}(\mathcal{I})$  satisfies  $v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C)) \leq 2v(\Pi(C))$  for every capacity  $C \leq l(\mathcal{I})$ . By Theorem 1, it suffices to show  $v(\Pi(C)) \geq v(\text{MGREEDY}(\mathcal{I}, C))$  for all capacities. We distinguish between swap capacities and capacities where MGREEDY outputs a greedy set.

First, assume that  $C$  is a swap capacity, and let  $\{\Pi_k\} = \text{MGREEDY}(\mathcal{I}, C)$  be the swap item returned by the modified greedy algorithm. Then,  $\Pi(C)$  contains at least one item  $\Pi_j$  with  $j \leq k$ . By Lemma 5 we have

$$v(\Pi(C)) \geq v(\Pi_j) \geq v(\Pi_k) = v(\text{MGREEDY}(\mathcal{I}, C)).$$

Now assume that  $C$  is not a swap capacity. Let  $G^+ = \text{MGREEDY}(\mathcal{I}, C) \setminus \Pi(C)$  be the set of items in the greedy set for capacity  $C$  that are not packed by the permutation  $\Pi$ . Similarly, let  $U^+ = \Pi(C) \setminus \text{MGREEDY}(\mathcal{I}, C)$ . If  $G^+ = \emptyset$ , then  $v(\Pi(C)) \geq v(\text{MGREEDY}(\mathcal{I}, C))$  and we are done. Suppose now that  $G^+ \neq \emptyset$ . Then, also  $U^+ \neq \emptyset$ . For all items  $i \in U^+$ , we have  $l(i) \leq C$  and  $i \notin \text{MGREEDY}(\mathcal{I}, C)$ . Since  $C$  is not a swap capacity,  $\text{MGREEDY}(\mathcal{I}, C)$  is the greedy set for capacity  $C$ , and thus  $\tilde{d}(i) \prec \tilde{d}(i')$  for all  $i \in U^+$  and  $i' \in G^+$ . By definition of  $\Pi(C)$  and since  $U^+ \neq \emptyset$ , we also have  $k = \min\{j \mid \Pi_j \in U^+\} < \min\{k' \mid \Pi_{k'} \in G^+\}$ , i.e., the first item  $\Pi_k \in U^+$  in  $\Pi$  is encountered before every item from  $G^+$ . It follows that

$$G^+ \subseteq \{\Pi_j \mid j > k \text{ and } \tilde{d}(\Pi_j) \succ \tilde{d}(\Pi_k)\}.$$

Using  $v(U^+) \geq v(\Pi_k)$  and  $v(\Pi_k) \geq v(G^+)$  (Lemma 6) we get

$$\begin{aligned} v(\Pi(C)) &= v(\Pi(C) \cap \text{MGREEDY}(\mathcal{I}, C)) + v(U^+) \\ &\geq v(\Pi(C) \cap \text{MGREEDY}(\mathcal{I}, C)) + v(G^+) = v(\text{MGREEDY}(\mathcal{I}, C)). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

While it is obvious that UNIVERSAL runs in polynomial time, we show that it can be modified to run in time  $\Theta(n \log n)$ .

**Theorem 7.** *The algorithm UNIVERSAL can be implemented to run in time  $\Theta(n \log n)$ .*

*Proof.* We first argue how all swap items can be determined in time  $\Theta(n \log n)$ . We use that an item is a swap item if and only if it is worth more than all smaller items of higher density combined. This is true, because every item  $i$  that is worth more than all smaller items of higher density is a

swap item for capacity  $l(i)$ . Conversely, a swap item  $i$  for capacity  $C \geq l(i)$  is worth more than all items of higher density that are smaller than  $C$ .

We maintain a balanced search tree for items that is ordered by size and stores the total value of the items of both subtrees in the corresponding root. Inserting an item into this tree as well as determining whether an item is worth more than all smaller items in the tree both takes time  $\Theta(\log n)$ . To determine the set of swap items, we iterate over all items in order of decreasing densities and insert items one by one into the search tree. After each insertion, we query whether the newly inserted item is worth more than all smaller items in the tree. This is true if and only if the item is worth more than all smaller items of higher density, i.e., if and only if the item is a swap item. Including the initial sorting by density, we can determine all swap items in time  $\Theta(n \log n)$ .

We construct the output permutation  $\Pi$  by iterating over the items in order of increasing size, as in Algorithm 2. We maintain a list  $L$  of balanced search trees, each ordered by density. Except for the last tree in  $L$ , every tree contains exactly one swap item, which is the item of smallest density in the tree. The density of a tree is the density of this swap item (or 0 if the tree has no swap item). Each tree stores the items in  $\Pi$  to the left of the corresponding swap item (if it exists) and to the right of the swap item of the preceding tree in  $L$  (if it exists). We start with a list containing a single tree with no corresponding swap item, which eventually holds all non-swap items that end up behind the last swap item in  $\Pi$ . Whenever we encounter a new swap item, we add a new tree consisting of only this swap item to the front of  $L$ . For each non-swap item, we have to find the correct tree to insert it into. Once we know the tree, we can determine the position at which to insert the item into the tree, and thus in  $\Pi$ , in time  $\Theta(\log n)$  simply by searching the tree.

To complete the proof, we need an efficient way to find the correct tree in  $L$  for a non-swap item. For this purpose, we maintain a sublist  $L'$  of  $L$  that contains only those trees that are needed for the remainder of the algorithm. Whenever a new swap item  $s$  adds a tree to the front of  $L$ , we also add the tree to the front of  $L'$ . Observe that from this point on no items are inserted into trees of a higher density than  $s$ . Hence, before inserting the tree of  $s$  to  $L'$ , we may remove trees of higher density from the front of  $L'$ . This guarantees that  $L'$  remains sorted by density. We can thus implement  $L'$  as a balanced search tree order by density. This way, we can find the correct tree for each non-swap item in time  $\Theta(\log n)$ . Since every tree is removed at most once from  $L'$ , the amortized cost for maintaining the sublist is constant for each swap item.

Since UNIVERSAL requires  $n$  iterations, the total running time is  $\Theta(n \log n)$ .  $\square$

We now give a general lower bound on the robustness factor of any policy for the oblivious knapsack problem. This shows that UNIVERSAL is best possible.

**Theorem 8.** *For every  $\delta > 0$ , there are instances of the oblivious knapsack problem where no policy achieves a robustness factor of  $2 - \delta$ .*

*Proof.* We give a family of instances, one for each size  $n \geq 3$ . We ensure that for every item  $i$  of the instance of size  $n$ , there is a capacity  $C$ , such that packing item  $i$  first can only lead to a solution that is worse than  $\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C)$  by a factor of at least  $(2 - 4/n)$ . This completes the proof, as the factor approaches 2 for increasing values of  $n$ .

The instance of size  $n$  is given by  $\mathcal{I} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  with

$$l(i) = F_n + F_i - 1, \quad v(i) = 1 + \frac{i}{n},$$

where  $F_i$  denotes the  $i$ -th Fibonacci number ( $F_1 = 1, F_2 = 1, F_3 = 2, \dots$ ).

We need to show that, no matter which item is tried first (i.e., no matter which item is the root of the policy), there is a capacity for which this choice ruins the solution. Observe that both values and



---

**Algorithm 3:** UNIVERSALUD( $\mathcal{I}$ )

---

**Input:** set of items  $\mathcal{I}$   
**Output:** sequence of items  $\Pi$   
 $L \leftarrow \langle \text{items in } \mathcal{I} \text{ sorted such that } L_1 \prec \dots \prec L_n \rangle$   
 $\Pi^{(0)} \leftarrow \emptyset$   
**for**  $r \leftarrow 1, \dots, n$  **do**  
     $j \leftarrow 1$   
    **while**  $j \leq |\Pi|$  **and**  $v(L_r) < \varphi v(\Pi_j^{(r-1)})$  **do**  
         $j \leftarrow j + 1$   
     $\Pi^{(r)} \leftarrow (\Pi_1^{(r-1)}, \dots, \Pi_{j-1}^{(r-1)}, L_r, \Pi_j^{(r-1)}, \dots)$   
**return**  $\Pi^{(n)}$

---

sizes of the items are strictly increasing. Assume that item  $i \geq 3$  is packed first. Since the smallest item has size  $l(1) = F_n$ , for capacity  $C_i = 2F_n + F_i - 2 < 2F_n + F_i - 1 = l(1) + l(i)$ , no additional item fits the knapsack. However, the unique optimum solution in this case is  $\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C_i) = \{i-1, i-2\}$ . These two items fit the knapsack, as  $l(i-1) + l(i-2) = 2F_n + F_{i-1} + F_{i-2} - 2 = 2F_n + F_i - 2 = C_i$ . By definition,

$$\frac{v(i-1) + v(i-2)}{v_i} = \frac{2n + 2i - 3}{n + i} = 2 - \frac{3}{n + i} \geq 2 - \frac{3}{n}.$$

Hence, policies that first pack item  $i \geq 3$  do not achieve a robustness factor  $\alpha < 2 - 3/n$ .

Now, assume that one of the two smallest items is packed first. For capacity  $C_{1,2} = l(n) = 2F_n - 1 < 2F_n = l(1) + l(2)$ , no additional item fits the knapsack. The unique optimum solution, however, is to pack item  $n$ . It remains to compute the ratios

$$\frac{v(n)}{v(1)} > \frac{v(n)}{v(2)} = \frac{2n}{n+2} = 2 - \frac{4}{n+2} > 2 - \frac{4}{n}.$$

Hence, policies that first pack item 1 or item 2 do not achieve a robustness factor  $\alpha < 2 - 4/n$ .  $\square$

## 4 Unit Densities

In this section we restrict ourselves to instances of the oblivious knapsack problem, where all items have unit density, i.e.,  $v(i) = l(i)$  for all items  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ . For two items  $i, j \in \mathcal{I}$  we say that  $i$  is smaller than  $j$  and write  $i \prec j$  if  $v(i) < v(j)$ , or  $v(i) = v(j)$  and  $t(i) < t(j)$ , where  $t$  is the tiebreaking index introduced in Section 3. We give an algorithm UNIVERSALUD (cf. Algorithm 3) that produces a universal policy tailored to achieve the best possible robustness factor equal to the golden ratio  $\varphi \approx 1.618$ . The algorithm considers the items from smallest to largest, and inserts each item into the output sequence as far to the end as possible, such that the item is not preceded by other items that are more than a factor  $\varphi$  smaller. Intuitively, the algorithm tries as much as possible to keep the resulting order sorted increasingly by size; only when an item dominates another item by a factor of at least  $\varphi$  the algorithm ensures that it precedes this item in the final sequence. Note that, even though  $\varphi$  is irrational, for rationals  $a, b$  the condition  $a < \varphi b$  can be tested efficiently by testing the equivalent condition  $a/b < 1 + b/a$ .

**Theorem 9.** *The algorithm UNIVERSALUD constructs a universal policy of robustness factor  $\varphi$  when all items have unit density.*

*Proof.* Given an instance  $\mathcal{I}$  of the oblivious knapsack problem with unit densities and any capacity  $C \leq v(\mathcal{I})$ , we compare the packing  $\Pi(C)$  that results from the solution  $\Pi = \text{UNIVERSALUD}(\mathcal{I})$  with an optimal packing  $\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C)$ . We define the set  $M$  of items in  $\Pi(C)$  for which at least one smaller item is not in  $\Pi(C)$ , i.e., more precisely, let  $M = \{i \in \Pi(C) \mid \exists j \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \Pi(C) : j \prec i\}$ .

We first consider the case that  $M \neq \emptyset$  and set  $i = \min_{\prec} M$  to be the smallest item in  $M$  with respect to ' $\prec$ '. Consider the iteration  $r$  of  $\text{UNIVERSALUD}$  in which  $i$  is inserted into  $\Pi$ , i.e.,  $i = L_r$ . By definition of  $M$ , there is an item  $j \prec i$  with  $j \notin \Pi(C)$ . Let  $j$  be the first such item in  $\Pi$ . Since  $j \prec i$ , we have  $j \in \Pi^{(r)}$ . From  $i \in \Pi(C)$  and  $j \notin \Pi(C)$ , it follows that  $i$  precedes  $j$  in  $\Pi$  (and thus in  $\Pi^{(r)}$ ). Let  $i'$  be the item directly preceding  $j$  in  $\Pi^{(r)}$ . If  $i' = i$ ,  $i$  was compared with  $j$  when it was inserted into  $\Pi^{(r)}$ , with the result that  $v(i) \geq \varphi v(j)$  and thus  $v(\Pi(C)) \geq \varphi v(j)$ . If  $i' \neq i$ , by definition of  $j$ , we still have  $i' \in \Pi(C)$ . Also, either  $i' \succ j$  and thus  $v(i') \geq v(j)$ , or  $j$  was compared with  $i'$  when it was inserted into  $\Pi$  in an earlier iteration of  $\text{UNIVERSALUD}$ , with the result that  $v(i') > \frac{1}{\varphi} v(j)$ . Again,  $v(\Pi(C)) \geq v(i) + v(i') > v(j) + \frac{1}{\varphi} v(j) = \varphi v(j)$ .

In both cases it follows from  $j \notin \Pi(C)$  that  $v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C)) \leq C < v(\Pi(C)) + v(j)$ , and using  $v(j) \leq \frac{1}{\varphi} v(\Pi(C))$  we get

$$\frac{v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C))}{v(\Pi(C))} < \frac{v(\Pi(C)) + v(j)}{v(\Pi(C))} < 1 + \frac{1}{\varphi} = \varphi.$$

Now, assume that  $M = \emptyset$ . Intuitively, this means that  $\Pi(C)$  consists of a prefix of  $L$  (the smallest items). Let  $i_1 \succ \dots \succ i_k$  be the items in  $\Pi(C) \setminus \text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C)$ , and let  $j_1 \succ \dots \succ j_l$  be the items in  $\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C) \setminus \Pi(C)$ . As  $\Pi(C)$  consists of a prefix of  $L$ , we have  $|\Pi(C)| \geq |\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C)|$  and thus  $k \geq l$ . If  $k = 0$ , the claim trivially holds. Otherwise, since  $M$  is empty, we have  $j_l \succ i_1$ . It suffices to show  $v(j_h) \leq \varphi v(i_h)$  for all  $h \leq l$ . To this end, we consider any fixed  $h \leq l$ . From  $v(\{i_1, \dots, i_{h-1}\}) \leq v(\{j_1, \dots, j_{h-1}\})$  it follows that

$$v(j_h) \leq v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C)) - v(\{j_1, \dots, j_{h-1}\}) \leq C - v(\{i_1, \dots, i_{h-1}\}).$$

This implies that  $j_h$  cannot precede all items of  $\{i_h, \dots, i_k\}$  in  $\Pi$ , as  $j_h \notin \Pi(C)$ . Hence, there is an item  $i \in \{i_h, \dots, i_k\}$  that precedes  $j_h$  in  $\Pi$ . Since  $j_h \succ i$ , in the iteration when  $\text{UNIVERSALUD}$  inserted  $j_h$  into  $\Pi$ ,  $i$  was already present. From the fact that  $i$  ended up preceding  $j_h$  it follows that  $j_h$  was compared with  $i$  and thus  $v(j_h) < \varphi v(i) \leq \varphi v(i_h)$ . We obtain

$$\frac{v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C))}{v(\Pi(C))} \leq \frac{v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C) \setminus \Pi(C))}{v(\Pi(C) \setminus \text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C))} = \frac{\sum_{h=1}^l v(j_h)}{\sum_{h=1}^k v(i_h)} \leq \frac{\sum_{h=1}^l \varphi v(i_h)}{\sum_{h=1}^l v(i_h)} = \varphi,$$

which implies the result.  $\square$

A naïve implementation of  $\text{UNIVERSALUD}$  runs in time  $\Theta(n^2)$ . We improve this running time to  $\Theta(n \log n)$ .

**Theorem 10.** *The algorithm  $\text{UNIVERSALUD}$  can be implemented to run in time  $\Theta(n \log n)$ .*

*Proof.* To improve the running time from the naïve  $\Theta(n^2)$ , we maintain a balanced search tree  $T$  that stores a subset of the items in  $\Pi$  sorted decreasingly by their sizes. Whenever an item gets inserted to the front of  $\Pi$ , and only then, we also insert it into  $T$ . This way, the items in  $T$  remain sorted by their positions in  $\Pi$  throughout the execution of the algorithm. We need an efficient way of finding, in each iteration  $r$  of  $\text{UNIVERSALUD}$  (Algorithm 3), the first item  $i$  in  $\Pi^{(r)}$  for which  $v(L_r) \geq \varphi v(i)$ , or detecting that no such item exists. We claim that, if such an item exists, it is stored in  $T$  and can thus be found in time  $\Theta(\log n)$ .

It suffices to show that for every item  $i \in T$  and its predecessor  $j$  in  $T$  we have that none of the items that precede  $i$  in  $\Pi$  are smaller than  $j$ . To see this, we argue that none of the items between  $j$  and  $i$  in  $\Pi$  are smaller than  $j$ . We can then repeat the argument for  $j$  and its predecessor  $j'$ , etc. For the sake of contradiction, let  $i'$  be the first item between  $j$  and  $i$  with  $v(i') < v(j)$ . None of the items between  $j$  and  $i'$  are smaller than  $j$ , hence both  $j$  and  $i'$  are inserted into  $\Pi$  earlier than all of them. Let  $r$  be the iteration in which  $j$  is inserted into  $\Pi$ . Since  $i'$  is inserted earlier into  $\Pi$ , and since  $j$  is inserted to the front of  $\Pi^{(r)}$ ,  $i'$  is at the front of  $\Pi^{(r-1)}$ . This is a contradiction to  $i'$  not being in  $T$ .  $\square$

We now establish that UNIVERSALUD is best possible, even if we permit non-universal policies.

**Theorem 11.** *There are instances of the oblivious knapsack problem where no policy achieves a robustness factor of  $\varphi - \delta$ , for any  $\delta > 0$ , even when all items have unit density.*

*Proof.* Consider an instance of the oblivious knapsack problem with five items of unit density and values equal to  $v_1 = 1 + \varepsilon, v_2 = 1 + \varepsilon, v_3 = 2/\varphi, v_4 = 1 + 1/\varphi^2, v_5 = \varphi$ , for sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We show that no algorithm achieves a robustness factor of  $\varphi - \delta$  for this instance. To this end we consider an arbitrary algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  and distinguish different cases depending on which item the algorithm tries to pack first.

- (a) If  $\mathcal{A}$  tries item 1 or item 2 first, it cannot fit any additional item for a capacity equal to  $v_5 = \varphi$ , as even  $v_1 + v_2 > \varphi$ . For this capacity  $\mathcal{A}$  is worse by a factor of  $\varphi/(1 + \varepsilon) > \varphi - \delta$  than the optimum solution, which packs item 5.
- (b) If  $\mathcal{A}$  tries item 3 first, it cannot fit any additional item for a capacity equal to  $v_1 + v_2 = 2 + 2\varepsilon$ , as even  $v_3 + v_1 > 2 + 2\varepsilon$ . For this capacity  $\mathcal{A}$  is worse by a factor of  $(1 + \varepsilon)\varphi > \varphi - \delta$  than the optimum solution which packs items 1 and 2.
- (c) If  $\mathcal{A}$  tries item 4 first, it cannot fit any additional item for a capacity equal to  $v_2 + v_3 = 1 + 2/\varphi + \varepsilon$ , as even  $v_4 + v_1 = 2 + 1/\varphi^2 + \varepsilon > 1 + 2/\varphi + \varepsilon$ . For this capacity  $\mathcal{A}$  is worse by a factor of  $\frac{1+2/\varphi+\varepsilon}{1+1/\varphi^2} > \frac{\varphi+1/\varphi}{1+1/\varphi^2} = \varphi > \varphi - \delta$  than the optimum solution which packs items 2 and 3.
- (d) If  $\mathcal{A}$  tries item 5 first, it cannot fit any additional item for a capacity equal to  $v_3 + v_4 = \varphi + 1$ , as even  $v_5 + v_1 = \varphi + 1 + \varepsilon > \varphi + 1$ . For this capacity  $\mathcal{A}$  is worse by a factor of  $\frac{\varphi+1}{\varphi} = \varphi > \varphi - \delta$  than the optimum solution which packs items 3 and 4.

$\square$

## 5 Hardness

Although we can always find a 2-robust universal policy in polynomial time, we show in this section that, for any fixed  $\alpha \in (1, \infty)$ , it is intractable to decide whether a given policy is  $\alpha$ -robust, even if it is universal. This hardness result also holds for instances with unit densities when  $\alpha$  is part of the input. As the final – and arguably the most interesting – result of this section, we establish coNP-hardness of the the problem to decide for a given instance and given  $\alpha > 1$ , whether the instance admits a universal policy with robustness factor  $\alpha$ . All proofs rely on the hardness of the following version of SUBSETSUM.

**Lemma 12.** *Let  $W = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\}$  be a set of positive integer weights and  $T \leq \sum_{k=1}^n w_k$  be a target sum. The problem of deciding whether there is a subset  $U \subseteq W$  with  $\sum_{w \in U} w = T$  is NP-complete, even when*

1.  $T = 2^k$  for some integer  $k \geq 3$ ,
- (a) all weights are in the interval  $[2, T/2)$ ,
- (b) all weights have a difference of at least 2 to the closest power of 2.

*Proof.* Without Properties 1 to 1b, the SUBSETSUM problem is well known to be NP-complete (e.g., Garey and Johnson [11]). Given an instance  $(W, T)$  of this classical problem, we construct an equivalent instance with Properties 1 to 1b. We first multiply all weights in  $W$  as well as the target sum  $T$  with 6 to obtain an equivalent instance  $(W', T')$ . In the new instance, all weights are even but not a power of 2, hence they have distance at least 2 to the closest power of 2. We set  $T'' = 2^\sigma$ , with  $\sigma = \lceil \log_2(T' + \sum_{w' \in W'} w') \rceil + 2$  and define two new weights

$$u = \left\lfloor \frac{T'' - T'}{2} \right\rfloor, \quad w = \left\lceil \frac{T'' - T'}{2} \right\rceil.$$

We set  $W'' = W' \cup \{u, w\}$  to obtain the final instance  $(W'', T'')$ . Properties 1 and 1a are satisfied by construction. Also, any solution to the instance  $(W'', T'')$  has to include both  $u$  and  $w$ , since  $T'' > 4 \cdot \sum_{w' \in W'} w'$ . Hence, the instance remains equivalent to the original instance  $(W, T)$ . Since  $T'' - T' > 3T''/4$ , and since  $T''$  is a power of two, the new items  $u$  and  $w$  are far enough from the closest power of 2 (which either is  $T''/2$  or  $T''/4$ ).  $\square$

We first show that it is intractable to determine the robustness factor of a given universal policy.

**Theorem 13.** *For any fixed and polynomially representable  $\alpha > 1$  it is coNP-complete to decide whether a given universal policy for the oblivious knapsack problem is  $\alpha$ -robust.*

*Proof.* Regarding the membership in coNP, note that if a universal policy  $\Pi$  is not  $\alpha$ -robust, then there is a capacity  $C$  such that  $v(\Pi(C)) < v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C))/\alpha$ . Thus,  $C$  together with  $\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C)$  is a certificate for  $\Pi$  not being an  $\alpha$ -robust solution.

For the proof of coNP-hardness, we reduce from the variant of SUBSETSUM specified in Lemma 12. An instance of this problem is given by a set  $W = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\}$  of positive integer weights in the range  $[2, T/2)$  and a target sum  $T = 2^k$  for some integer  $k \geq 3$ . Let  $\alpha > 1$  be polynomially representable. We may assume without loss of generality that  $\alpha > \frac{T}{T-1}$  as we can ensure this property by multiplying  $T$  and all items in  $W$  by a sufficiently large power of 2.

We construct an instance  $\mathcal{I}$  and a sequence  $\Pi$  such that  $\Pi$  is an  $\alpha$ -robust universal policy for  $\mathcal{I}$  if and only if the instance of SUBSETSUM given by  $W$  and  $T$  has no solution. To this end, we introduce for each weight  $w \in W$  an item with value and size equal to  $w$ . In this way, the optimal knapsack solution for capacity  $T$  is at least  $T$  if the instance of SUBSETSUM has a solution. Furthermore, we introduce a set of additional items that make sure that the robustness factor for all capacities except  $T$  is at most  $\alpha$  while maintaining the property that the optimal knapsack solution for capacity  $T$  is strictly less than  $T$  if the instance of SUBSETSUM has no solution.

We now explain the construction of  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\Pi$  in detail. Let  $\varepsilon = \frac{\alpha(T-1)-T}{\alpha(T-1)-1}$ , i.e.,  $\alpha = \frac{T-\varepsilon}{(T-1)(1-\varepsilon)}$ . Note that  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  by our assumptions on  $T$  and  $\alpha$ . For each weight  $w \in W$ , we introduce an item  $i_w$  with  $l(i_w) = v(i_w) = w$ . The set of these items is called *regular* and is denoted by  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{reg}}$ . Furthermore, we introduce a set of auxiliary items. Let  $m = \log_2 T - 1$ . Then, for each

$k \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ , we introduce an auxiliary item  $j_k$  with size  $l(j_k) = 2^k$  and value  $v(j_k) = 2^k (1 - \varepsilon)$ . Denoting the set of auxiliary items by  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{aux}}$ , we have  $l(\mathcal{I}_{\text{aux}}) = \sum_{k=0}^m 2^k = T - 1$ . Finally, we introduce a dummy item  $d$  with  $l(d) = T + 1$  and

$$v(d) = \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{\varepsilon} (v(\mathcal{I}_{\text{aux}}) + v(\mathcal{I}_{\text{reg}})) = \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \left( (T - 1)(1 - \varepsilon) + \sum_{w \in W} w \right).$$

The universal policy  $\Pi$  is defined as  $\Pi = (d, j_m, j_{m-1}, \dots, j_0, i_{w_n}, i_{w_{n-1}}, \dots, i_{w_1})$ . The hardness proof relies on the claim that  $\Pi$  is a  $\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}$ -robust universal policy for all capacities except  $T$ , i.e.,

$$v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C)) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} v(\Pi(C)) \text{ for all } C \neq T. \quad (2)$$

As all item sizes are integer, it suffices to consider integer capacities. To prove (2), let us first consider capacities  $C \leq T - 1$ . Since the density of each item with size not larger than  $T - 1$  is bounded from above by 1, it is sufficient to show that  $v(\Pi(C)) = C(1 - \varepsilon)$ . To this end, we show that every capacity  $C \in \{1, \dots, 2^{m+1} - 1 = T - 1\}$  is packed without a gap by the exponentially decreasing sequence of items  $j_m, j_{m-1}, \dots, j_0$ . We prove this statement by induction over  $m$ . For  $m = 0$ , the statement is true, since there is only a single item with length 1, which packs the capacity  $C = 1$  optimally. Now assume that the statement is true for all  $m' < m$  and consider the sequence  $j_m, j_{m-1}, \dots, j_0$ . We distinguish two cases. For capacities  $C \in \{2^m, \dots, 2^{m+1} - 1\}$ , item  $j_m$  is packed and, using the induction hypothesis, the residual capacity  $\tilde{C} = C - 2^m \leq 2^{m+1} - 1 - 2^m \leq 2^m - 1$  can be packed without a gap by the remaining sequence  $j_{m-1}, j_{m-2}, \dots, j_0$ . For capacities  $C < 2^m$ , item  $j_m$  is not packed, and, again using the induction hypothesis, we derive that  $C$  can be packed by  $j_{m-1}, \dots, j_0$ . This completes the proof of our claim for  $C \leq T - 1$ .

Let us now consider our claim for capacities  $C \geq T + 1$ . In this case,  $d \in \Pi(C)$  and we can trivially bound the robustness factor of  $\Pi$  by observing that

$$\frac{v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C))}{v(\Pi(C))} \leq \frac{v(\mathcal{I})}{v(d)} = 1 + \frac{(T - 1)(1 - \varepsilon) + \sum_{w \in W} w}{v(d)} = 1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon} = \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

We proceed to show that  $\Pi$  is an  $\alpha$ -robust universal policy if and only if the instance of SUBSET-SUM given by  $W$  and  $T$  has no solution. Let us first assume that the instance of SUBSET-SUM has no solution. We prove that  $\Pi$  is  $\alpha$ -robust. For all capacities except  $T$  this is clear from claim (2). For capacity  $T$ , we argue as follows: As there is no packing of  $T$  with items of density 1, we bound  $v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, T))$  from above by  $(T - 1) + (1 - \varepsilon)$ , whereas  $\Pi$  packs all auxiliary items. We get

$$\frac{v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, T))}{v(\Pi(T))} \leq \frac{(T - 1) + (1 - \varepsilon)}{(T - 1)(1 - \varepsilon)} = \alpha.$$

Now, assume that the instance of SUBSET-SUM has a solution. Then,  $v(\text{OPT}(T)) = T$  and thus

$$\frac{v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, T))}{v(\Pi(T))} = \frac{T}{(T - 1)(1 - \varepsilon)} > \alpha,$$

and we conclude that  $\Pi$  is not  $\alpha$ -robust.  $\square$

We give a result similar to Theorem 13 for instances in which each item has unit density. Note that this time we require  $\alpha$  to be part of the input.

**Theorem 14.** *It is coNP-complete to decide whether, for given  $\alpha > 1$ , a given universal policy for the oblivious knapsack problem is  $\alpha$ -robust, even when all items have unit density.*

*Proof.* Membership in coNP follows from Theorem 13. To prove hardness, we again reduce from SUBSETSUM (Lemma 12) using a similar construction as in the proof of Theorem 13. Let the set  $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_n\}$  of weights and the target sum  $T \geq 8$  of an instance of SUBSETSUM be given, with  $w_1 \leq w_2 \leq \dots \leq w_n$ . We proceed to explain the construction of a universal policy  $\Pi$  for which the decision whether  $\Pi$  is  $\alpha$ -robust is coNP-hard, for some  $\alpha > 1$ .

For each weight  $w \in W$ , we introduce an item  $i_w$  with value  $v(i_w) = w$ . The set of these items is called *regular* and is denoted by  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{reg}}$ . Let  $m = \log_2 T - 1$  and  $\varepsilon = 1/T^2$ . For each  $k \in \{0, \dots, m\}$ , we introduce an auxiliary item  $j_k$  with value  $v(j_k) = 2^k(1 - \varepsilon)$ . Denoting the set of auxiliary items by  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{aux}}$ , we have  $v(\mathcal{I}_{\text{aux}}) = (1 - \varepsilon) \sum_{k=0}^m 2^k = (1 - \varepsilon)(T - 1)$ . We further introduce a set of dummy items  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{dum}} = \{d_0, \dots, d_{m'}\}$ , where  $m' = \lceil \log_2 w_n \rceil$ . We set  $v(d_k) = T \cdot 2^k$  for each  $k \in \{1, \dots, m'\}$ , and  $v(d_0) = T + \varepsilon$ . The values of the dummy items sum up to  $v(\mathcal{I}_{\text{dum}}) = (T + \varepsilon) + T \sum_{k=1}^{m'} 2^k = T(2^{m'+1} - 1) + \varepsilon$ . In total, the sum of the values of all dummy and auxiliary items is

$$S = v(\mathcal{I}_{\text{aux}}) + v(\mathcal{I}_{\text{dum}}) = (1 - \varepsilon)(T - 1) + T(2^{m'+1} - 1) + \varepsilon. \quad (3)$$

Finally, we define the sequence  $\Pi$  as

$$\Pi = (d_{m'}, d_{m'-1}, \dots, d_0, j_m, j_{m-1}, \dots, j_0, i_{w_n}, i_{w_{n-1}}, \dots, i_{w_1}),$$

i.e.,  $\Pi$  first tries to pack the dummy items in decreasing order, then the auxiliary items in decreasing order, and finally the regular items in non-increasing order. Let  $\alpha = \frac{T - \varepsilon}{(1 - \varepsilon)(T - 1)}$ . We proceed to prove the statement of the theorem by showing that  $\Pi$  is an  $\alpha$ -robust universal policy if and only if the instance  $(W, T)$  of SUBSETSUM has no solution. To this end, we first prove that  $\Pi$  is always an  $\alpha$ -robust universal policy for all capacities except the *critical* capacities in the interval  $[T - \varepsilon T, T + \varepsilon]$ . Then, we argue that  $\Pi$  is  $\alpha$ -robust for the critical capacities if and only if the instance  $(W, T)$  of SUBSETSUM has no solution.

We start by proving that  $v(\Pi(C))$  is within an  $\alpha$ -fraction of  $v(\text{OPT}(C))$  for all capacities  $C \in [0, T - \varepsilon T]$ . Since the regular items are of integer values and the values of the auxiliary items each are an  $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -fraction of an integer, only capacities  $C$  for which the ratio  $C/\lceil C \rceil$  is not smaller than  $1 - \varepsilon$  can be packed without a gap. Otherwise, the value of an optimal solution is bounded from above by  $\lfloor C \rfloor$ . For capacities  $C \in [0, T - \varepsilon T]$ , we obtain

$$v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C)) \leq \begin{cases} C, & \text{if } C/\lceil C \rceil \geq 1 - \varepsilon \\ \lfloor C \rfloor, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

The value packed by  $\Pi$  is given by

$$v(\Pi(C)) = \begin{cases} (1 - \varepsilon)\lceil C \rceil, & \text{if } C/\lceil C \rceil \geq 1 - \varepsilon \\ (1 - \varepsilon)\lfloor C \rfloor, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

From (4) and (5) it follows that

$$v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C)) \leq \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} v(\Pi(C)) < \alpha v(\Pi(C)) \quad (6)$$

for all  $C \in [0, T - \varepsilon T]$ .

We proceed to prove that  $\Pi$  is within an  $\alpha$ -fraction of an optimal solution for all capacities  $C \in [T + \varepsilon, S]$ . We distinguish two cases for each such capacity  $C$ .

*First case:*  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{aux}} \subset \Pi(C)$ , i.e., all auxiliary items are packed by  $\Pi$ . Since, in  $\Pi$ , the dummy item  $d_0$  with value  $T + \varepsilon$  precedes all auxiliary items, and since  $C \geq T + \varepsilon$ , this case can only occur for capacities

$$C \geq v(d_0) + v(\mathcal{I}_{\text{aux}}) = T + \varepsilon + (1 - \varepsilon)(T - 1) = 2(T + \varepsilon) - (1 + \varepsilon T). \quad (7)$$

On the other hand, the gap  $C - v(\Pi(C))$  is at most the gap left after trying all dummy items and packing all auxiliary items, i.e.,  $C - v(\Pi(C)) < v(d_0) - v(\mathcal{I}_{\text{aux}}) = T + \varepsilon - (1 - \varepsilon)(T - 1) = 1 + \varepsilon T$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C))}{v(\Pi(C))} &< \frac{C}{C - (1 + \varepsilon T)} \stackrel{(7)}{\leq} \frac{2(T + \varepsilon) - (1 + \varepsilon T)}{2(T + \varepsilon) - 2(1 + \varepsilon T)} \\ &= \frac{(T + \varepsilon) - (1 + \varepsilon T)/2}{(T + \varepsilon) - (1 + \varepsilon T)} \stackrel{T \geq 8}{<} \frac{T - \varepsilon}{(1 - \varepsilon)(T - 1)} = \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

*Second case:*  $\mathcal{I}_{\text{aux}} \setminus \Pi(C) \neq \emptyset$ , i.e., not all auxiliary items are packed. This implies that the gap  $C - v(\Pi(C))$  is at most  $1 - \varepsilon$ . We calculate

$$\frac{v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C))}{v(\Pi(C))} < \frac{C}{C - (1 - \varepsilon)} \stackrel{C \geq T + \varepsilon}{\leq} \frac{T + \varepsilon}{T + 2\varepsilon - 1} \stackrel{\varepsilon = 1/T^2}{<} \frac{T - \varepsilon}{(1 - \varepsilon)(T - 1)} = \alpha.$$

Next, we consider capacities  $C \in (S, v(\mathcal{I}_{\text{aux}} \cup \mathcal{I}_{\text{dum}} \cup \mathcal{I}_{\text{reg}})]$ . For these capacities, all dummy items and all auxiliary items are packed by  $\Pi$ . Using that the gap  $C - \Pi(C)$  is at most  $w_n$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C))}{v(\Pi(C))} &\leq \frac{C}{C - w_n} \stackrel{C > S}{<} \frac{S}{S - w_n} \stackrel{S > T2^{m'}}{<} \frac{T2^{m'}}{T2^{m'} - w_n} \\ &\leq \frac{T w_n}{T w_n - w_n} = \frac{T}{T - 1} = \frac{T(1 - \varepsilon)}{(1 - \varepsilon)(T - 1)} < \frac{T - \varepsilon}{(1 - \varepsilon)(T - 1)} = \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

To finish the proof, let us finally consider the critical capacities  $C \in [T - T\varepsilon, T + \varepsilon]$ . We proceed to show that  $v(\Pi(C))$  is within an  $\alpha$ -fraction of  $v(\text{OPT}(C))$  for all  $C \in [T - T\varepsilon, T + \varepsilon]$  if and only if  $(W, T)$  does not have a solution. Let us first assume that  $(W, T)$  does not have a solution. Then,  $v(\text{OPT}(C)) \leq T - \varepsilon$  and we obtain

$$\frac{v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C))}{v(\Pi(C))} \leq \frac{T - \varepsilon}{(T - 1)(1 - \varepsilon)} = \alpha,$$

for all  $C \in [T - T\varepsilon, T + \varepsilon]$ . If, on the other hand,  $(W, T)$  has a solution, then  $v(\text{OPT}(T)) = T$ , implying that

$$\frac{v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, T))}{v(\Pi(T))} = \frac{T}{(T - 1)(1 - \varepsilon)} > \alpha,$$

i.e.,  $\Pi$  is not an  $\alpha$ -robust universal policy.  $\square$

Finally, we prove that it is hard to decide whether a given instance admits an  $\alpha$ -robust universal policy when  $\alpha$  is part of the input.

**Theorem 15.** *It is coNP-hard to decide whether, for given  $\alpha > 1$ , an instance of the oblivious knapsack problem admits an  $\alpha$ -robust universal policy, even when all items have unit density.*

*Proof.* We again reduce from SUBSETSUM. To this end, let  $(W, T)$  be an instance of SUBSETSUM (Lemma 12), let  $\mathcal{I}$  be the set of items constructed from  $(W, T)$  in the proof of Theorem 14, and let  $\alpha = \frac{T-\varepsilon}{(1-\varepsilon)(T-1)}$ . We proceed to show that  $\mathcal{I}$  admits an  $\alpha$ -robust universal policy if and only if the instance  $(W, T)$  of SUBSETSUM has no solution.

For the case that  $(W, T)$  has no solution, an  $\alpha$ -robust universal policy is constructed in the proof of Theorem 14. Thus, it suffices to show that if  $(W, T)$  has a solution,  $\mathcal{I}$  does not admit an  $\alpha$ -robust universal policy.

First, we claim that any  $\alpha$ -robust universal policy  $\Pi$  contains the auxiliary items in decreasing order. Otherwise, for the sake of contradiction, let  $j$  be the first auxiliary item in  $\Pi$  that is preceded by a smaller auxiliary item  $i$ . Consider the capacity  $C = v(j)$ . As all dummy items are larger than  $T > C$ , only auxiliary and regular items can be in  $\Pi(C)$ . Since  $i$  precedes  $j$ , we have  $j \notin \Pi(C)$ .

If  $\Pi(C)$  contains only auxiliary items, since the sum of the values of the auxiliary items smaller than  $v(j)$  is  $v(j) - (1 - \varepsilon)$ , we can use that  $j \notin \Pi(C)$  to obtain  $v(\Pi(C)) \leq v(j) - (1 - \varepsilon) < \lfloor v(j) \rfloor$ . If  $\Pi(C)$  contains a regular item  $i'$ , then  $\frac{C-v(i')}{\lfloor C-v(i') \rfloor} < 1 - \varepsilon$ , and hence the gap  $C - v(i')$  cannot be packed with a value more than  $\lfloor C - v(i') \rfloor$ . It follows that  $v(\Pi(C)) \leq \lfloor v(j) \rfloor$ . In either case we have

$$\frac{v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, C))}{v(\Pi(C))} \geq \frac{v(j)}{\lfloor v(j) \rfloor} \stackrel{v(j) \leq (1-\varepsilon)T/2}{\geq} \frac{(1-\varepsilon)T/2}{\lfloor (1-\varepsilon)T/2 \rfloor} = \frac{(1-\varepsilon)T/2}{T/2-1} \stackrel{\varepsilon=1/T^2}{>} \frac{T-\varepsilon}{(T-1)(1-\varepsilon)} = \alpha.$$

This is a contradiction to the assumption that  $\Pi$  is  $\alpha$ -robust. We conclude that the auxiliary items appear in  $\Pi$  in decreasing order.

Second, we claim that if  $\Pi(T)$  contains a regular item, then  $\Pi$  is not  $\alpha$ -robust. By the argument above, we may assume that the auxiliary items in  $\Pi$  are ordered decreasingly. Let  $i$  be the regular item contained in  $\Pi(T)$  that appears first in  $\Pi$ . Consider the capacity  $C = (v(i) + 1)(1 - \varepsilon)$ . The auxiliary items that appear before  $i$  in  $\Pi$  (if any) are ordered decreasingly. All of them must be larger than  $v(i)$ , otherwise, the gap left after packing them for capacity  $T$  would be too small to fit  $i$ . By Lemma 12, we have that neither  $v(i)$  nor  $v(i) + 1$  are a power of 2, thus  $\Pi(C)$  does not contain any of the auxiliary items preceding  $i$ . All regular items that appear before  $i$  in  $\Pi$  are larger than  $v(i)$ , since they are not in  $\Pi(T)$ . Hence,  $\Pi(C)$  does not contain any regular items except  $i$ . We conclude that  $\Pi(C) = \{i\}$ . On the other hand,  $C$  is an integer multiple of  $1 - \varepsilon$  and can be packed without a gap by auxiliary items only. We obtain

$$\frac{v(\text{OPT}(C))}{v(\Pi(C))} = \frac{C}{v(i)} = \frac{(v(i) + 1)(1 - \varepsilon)}{v(i)} \stackrel{v(i) \leq T/2}{\geq} \frac{(T/2 + 1)(1 - \varepsilon)}{T/2} \stackrel{\varepsilon=1/T^2}{>} \alpha.$$

We conclude that if an  $\alpha$ -robust universal policy  $\Pi$  exists, then  $\Pi(T)$  does not contain regular items. It follows that  $\Pi(T) = \mathcal{I}_{\text{aux}}$  and, thus,  $v(\Pi(T)) = (T - 1)(1 - \varepsilon)$ . Using that the SUBSETSUM instance  $(W, T)$  has a solution, we obtain

$$\frac{v(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}, T))}{v(\Pi(T))} \geq \frac{T}{(T - 1)(1 - \varepsilon)} > \alpha,$$

which implies that no  $\alpha$ -robust universal policy exists.  $\square$



## References

- [1] M. A. Bender, R. Cole, and E. D. Demaine. Scanning and traversing: maintaining data for traversals in a memory hierarchy. In *Proceedings of the 10th European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA)*, pages 139–151, 2002.
- [2] D. Bertsimas and M. Sim. Robust discrete optimization and network flows. *Mathematical Programming*, 98:49–71, 2003.
- [3] A. Bhargat, A. Goel, and S. Khanna. Improved approximation results for stochastic knapsack problems. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1647–1665, 2011.
- [4] P. C. Bouman, J. M. van den Akker, and J. A. Hoogeveen. Recoverable robustness by column generation. In *Proceedings of the 19th European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA)*, pages 215–226, 2011.
- [5] C. Büsing, A. M. Koster, and M. Kutschka. Recoverable robust knapsacks: the discrete scenario case. *Optimization Letters*, 5(3):379–392, 2011.
- [6] J. L. Carter and M. N. Wegman. Universal classes of hash functions. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 18:143–154, 1979.
- [7] B. C. Dean, M. X. Goemans, and J. Vondrák. Approximating the stochastic knapsack problem: The benefit of adaptivity. In *Proceedings of the 45th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 208–217, 2004.
- [8] V. G. Deineko, R. Rudolf, and G. J. Woeginger. Sometimes travelling is easy: The master tour problem. In *Proceedings of the 3rd European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA)*, pages 128–141. 1995.
- [9] L. Epstein, A. Levin, A. Marchetti-Spaccamela, N. Megow, J. Mestre, M. Skutella, and L. Stougie. Universal sequencing on an unreliable machine. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 41(3):565–586, 2012.
- [10] M. Frigo, C. Leiserson, H. Prokop, and S. Ramachandran. Cache-oblivious algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 40th Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 285–297, 1999.
- [11] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability, A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. W.H. Freeman and Company, 1979.
- [12] K.-S. Goetzmann, S. Stiller, and C. Telha. Optimization over integers with robustness in cost and few constraints. In *Proceedings of the 9th Workshop on Approximation and Online Algorithms (WAOA)*, pages 89–101, 2011.
- [13] R. Hassin and S. Rubinstein. Robust matchings. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 15(4):530–537, 2002.
- [14] L. Jia, G. Lin, G. Noubir, R. Rajaraman, and R. Sundaram. Universal approximations for TSP, Steiner tree, and set cover. In *Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 386–395, 2005.

- [15] N. Kakimura, K. Makino, and K. Seimi. Computing knapsack solutions with cardinality robustness. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Algorithms and Computation (ISAAC)*, pages 693–702, 2011.
- [16] B. Korte and J. Vygen. *Combinatorial Optimization. Theory and Algorithms*. Springer, 2nd edition, 2002.
- [17] N. Megow and J. Mestre. Instance-sensitive robustness guarantees for sequencing with unknown packing and covering constraints. In *Proceedings of the 4th Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science (ITCS)*, pages 495–504, 2013.
- [18] R. Merkle and M. E. Hellman. Hiding information and signatures in trapdoor knapsacks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 24(5):525–530, 1978.
- [19] M. Monaci and U. Pferschy. On the robust knapsack problem. In *Proceedings of the 10th Cologne-Twente Workshop on Graphs and Combinatorial Optimization (CTW)*, pages 207–210, 2011.
- [20] C. H. Papadimitriou. *Computational Complexity*. Addison-Wesley, 1994.
- [21] H. Räcke. Survey on oblivious routing strategies. In *Proceedings of the 5th Conference on Computability in Europe: Mathematical Theory and Computational Practice (CiE)*, pages 419–429, 2009.
- [22] A. Shamir. A polynomial time algorithm for breaking the basic Merkle-Hellman cryptosystem. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 145–152, 1982.
- [23] L. G. Valiant and G. J. Brebner. Universal schemes for parallel communication. In *Proceedings of the 13th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 263–277, 1981.
- [24] G. Yu. On the max-min 0-1 knapsack problem with robust optimization applications. *Operations Research*, 44(2):407–415, 1996.