

an asymptotic deviation of at most about 22% [4]. This is fairly good and sufficient for most applications. (To further improve on this – at the cost of a considerable increase in running time – there also is an asymptotic “fully polynomial time approximation scheme” based on linear programming methods [7, p. 1574].)

We can apply the first-fit algorithm to ensemble packing using the two strategies sketched out above, as follows:

*Simultaneous First-Fit (SFF) Algorithm:*

$$\mathcal{B}_v = \text{FF}(R_v, M) \forall v \in V, \quad (5)$$

*Global First-Fit (GFF) Algorithm:*

$$\mathcal{B}_v = \{B \in \text{FF}(R_V, M) : B \cap R_v \neq \emptyset\} \forall v \in V. \quad (6)$$

## 5 Lower Bounds

Whenever heuristics are employed to solve difficult problems in combinatorial optimization, quality control becomes an important issue. For a minimization problem, we need a good *lower* bound on the optimum value of the target function which can be computed in a reasonable amount of time. With such a bound at hand, we can estimate the maximum deviation of the heuristic solution from the optimum. For the ensemble planning problem, a useful lower bound is provided by an appropriate generalization of the clique number, which we discuss in this section.

As in the preceding section, we let  $R_W = \bigcup_{w \in W} R_w \forall W \subseteq V$ . Similarly, the set of all ensembles in a given area set  $W \subseteq V$  is denoted  $\mathcal{B}_W$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{B}_W = \bigcup_{w \in W} \mathcal{B}_w$ . Our bound is based on the following simple observation:

**Lemma 1 (Packing Lemma)** *If  $\mathcal{B}$  is an admissible ensemble assignment w.r.t.  $R$  and  $M$ , then  $|\mathcal{B}_W| \geq p_M(R_W) \forall W \subseteq V$ .*

Lemma 1 follows immediately from the fact that if  $\mathcal{B}$  is admissible, then  $R_W \subseteq \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}_W} B \forall W \subseteq V$  and hence  $\mathcal{B}_W$  is an “ $M$ -cover” of a superset of  $R_W$  (which is just like an  $M$ -packing, except that the members of  $\mathcal{B}_W$  are not necessarily disjoint). Now consider the special case that  $W$  is a clique of  $G$ . In this case the subgraph of  $G^{\mathcal{B}}$  induced by  $\mathcal{B} \cap (W \times \mathcal{B}_W)$  always contains a clique of size  $|\mathcal{B}_W|$ . (For each  $B \in \mathcal{B}_W$  choose some  $w_B \in W$  s.t.  $B \in \mathcal{B}_{w_B}$ . Then  $\{(w_B, B) : B \in \mathcal{B}_W\}$  is a clique of the requested size.) Hence

$$p_M(R_W) \leq |\mathcal{B}_W| \leq \omega(G^{\mathcal{B}}) \leq \chi(G^{\mathcal{B}}). \quad (7)$$

Now we define

$$\pi_M^R(G) = \max\{p_M(R_W) : W \text{ clique of } G\}. \quad (8)$$

By taking the maximum over all cliques  $W$  of  $G$  on the left-hand side of Equation (7), and the minimum over all admissible ensemble assignments  $\mathcal{B}$  on the right-hand side, we obtain

$$\pi_M^R(G) \leq \chi_M^R(G). \quad (9)$$