

# Polynomial-time Local Improvement Algorithm for Consecutive Block Minimization

S. Haddadi<sup>1</sup>, S. Chenche<sup>1</sup>, M. Cheraitia<sup>1</sup>, and F. Guessoum<sup>1</sup>

LabSTIC  
8 Mai 1945 University  
BP 401, 24000 Guelma, Algeria  
<http://www.univ-guelma.dz/recherche/labs/labstic/index.html>  
[salim.haddadi@yahoo.com](mailto:salim.haddadi@yahoo.com)  
[sara.chenche@hotmail.fr](mailto:sara.chenche@hotmail.fr)  
[meryem.cheraitia@hotmail.fr](mailto:meryem.cheraitia@hotmail.fr)  
[fatima\\_guessoum@yahoo.fr](mailto:fatima_guessoum@yahoo.fr)

## 1 Introduction

Given a binary matrix, a block of consecutive ones (bco for short) is any maximal sequence of consecutive ones occurring in the same row. Consecutive block minimization (CBM) seeks for a permutation of the columns of the binary matrix so as to minimize the number of bco's. CBM is well known to be NP-hard. In view of this negative result, it would be necessary for dealing with the large instances arising in practice, to adopt a heuristic approach. This is what we do by proposing a polynomial-time local improvement algorithm. An empirical analysis of the algorithm is performed on a large set of randomly generated instances, as well as on five real-world instances.

## 2 The local improvement heuristic

Regarding CBM, we are not confronted with any “feasibility” problem. We are just seeking a permutation of the columns of the binary matrix that minimizes the number of bco's, and any arbitrary permutation can serve as a starting point for improvement. Let us prove some preliminary lemmas.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $B$  be a binary  $m \times 3$ -matrix. The number of occurrences of the row sequences 101 or 010 is*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k=m} (B_2^k - B_1^k \times B_2^k - B_2^k \times B_3^k + B_1^k \times B_3^k) \quad (1)$$

**Lemma 2.** *If we insert column  $j$  between the columns  $i$  and  $i + 1$  in a binary  $m \times n$ -matrix  $B$  we create  $\delta$  new bco's where*

$$\delta = \sum_{k=1}^{k=m} (B_j^k - B_i^k \times B_j^k - B_j^k \times B_{i+1}^k + B_i^k \times B_{i+1}^k) \quad (2)$$

**Lemma 3.** *If we remove column  $j$  from between the columns  $j - 1$  and  $j + 1$  in  $B$  we remove  $\delta$  bco's where*

$$\delta = \sum_{k=1}^{k=m} (B_j^k - B_{j-1}^k \times B_j^k - B_j^k \times B_{j+1}^k + B_{j-1}^k \times B_{j+1}^k) \quad (3)$$

We consider two different ways for improving  $\pi$  (by decreasing the number of bco's): either by interchanging two distinct columns or by shifting a single column.

## 2.1 Improvement by interchange

Suppose that we are presently inspecting the matrix  $A_\pi$  associated to some permutation  $\pi$  such that the number of bco's is  $\sigma$ . We consider the neighborhood  $\mathcal{N}(\pi)$  to be the set of all the permutations that result from  $\pi$  by interchanging two columns. We explore  $\mathcal{N}(\pi)$  searching for a permutation giving a smaller number of bco's. If no such permutation exists, the procedure ends. When an improvement  $\delta$  is achieved via an interchange of columns  $\pi(i)$  and  $\pi(j)$ ,  $i \neq j$  (call this new permutation  $\pi'$ ), we update  $\sigma \leftarrow \sigma - \delta$ ,  $\pi'(i) \leftarrow \pi(j)$ ,  $\pi'(j) \leftarrow \pi(i)$ , and  $\pi'(k) \leftarrow \pi(k)$ ,  $k \neq i, k \neq j$ . The entire process is repeated with  $\pi'$ .

Suppose that we interchange columns  $\pi(i)$  and  $\pi(i+1)$ . Consider first the special case where  $\pi(i)$  and  $\pi(j)$  are adjacent (i.e.  $j = i+1$ ).

**Lemma 4.** *There is an improvement by interchanging columns  $\pi(i)$  and  $\pi(i+1)$  if and only if  $\delta > 0$  where  $\delta$  is computed below. Furthermore, the resulting number of bco's by interchanging the two columns is  $\sigma - \delta$ .*

$$\delta^+ = \sum_{k=1}^{k=m} \left( A_{\pi(i-1)}^k \times A_{\pi(i+1)}^k + A_{\pi(i)}^k \times A_{\pi(i+2)}^k \right) \quad (4)$$

$$\delta^- = \sum_{k=1}^{k=m} \left( A_{\pi(i-1)}^k \times A_{\pi(i)}^k + A_{\pi(i+1)}^k \times A_{\pi(i+2)}^k \right) \quad (5)$$

$$\delta = \delta^+ - \delta^- \quad (6)$$

Consider now the general case where columns  $\pi(i)$  and  $\pi(j)$  are non adjacent (i.e. there exists at least one distinct column separating them).

**Lemma 5.** *There is an improvement by interchanging non adjacent columns  $\pi(i)$  and  $\pi(j)$  if and only if  $\delta > 0$  where  $\delta$  is computed below. Furthermore, the resulting number of bco's is  $\sigma - \delta$ .*

$$\delta_1^+ = \sum_{k=1}^{k=m} \left( A_{\pi(i-1)}^k \times A_{\pi(j)}^k + A_{\pi(j)}^k \times A_{\pi(i+1)}^k \right) \quad (7)$$

$$\delta_2^+ = \sum_{k=1}^{k=m} \left( A_{\pi(j-1)}^k \times A_{\pi(i)}^k + A_{\pi(i)}^k \times A_{\pi(j+1)}^k \right) \quad (8)$$

$$\delta_1^- = \sum_{k=1}^{k=m} \left( A_{\pi(i-1)}^k \times A_{\pi(i)}^k + A_{\pi(i)}^k \times A_{\pi(i+1)}^k \right) \quad (9)$$

$$\delta_2^- = \sum_{k=1}^{k=m} \left( A_{\pi(j-1)}^k \times A_{\pi(j)}^k + A_{\pi(j)}^k \times A_{\pi(j+1)}^k \right) \quad (10)$$

$$\delta = \delta_1^+ + \delta_2^+ - \delta_1^- - \delta_2^- \quad (11)$$

**Lemma 6.** *The complexity of the interchange procedure is  $O(mn^2(f-m))$  where  $f$  is the number of nonzero entries in  $A$ .*

Unfortunately, we cannot take advantage of the sparsity of the binary matrix as we may presume. The 0's are as important as the 1's for the computations in (4-6) and (7-10).

## 2.2 Improvement by shifting

We consider the neighborhood  $\mathcal{N}'(\pi)$  to be the set of all the permutations that result from  $\pi$  by shifting a single column, which means that the column in question leaves its position and is inserted elsewhere between two other columns. The set  $\mathcal{N}'(\pi)$  is scanned searching for a permutation giving a smaller number of bco's. If no such permutation exists, the procedure ends. Suppose that an improvement  $\delta$  is achieved by shifting column  $\pi(i)$ , and let  $\pi'$  be the resulting permutation. In the case of shifting, the necessary updates are a bit trickier. They depend on whether the value of

$\pi(i)$  is less or greater than its future position since we have to move several columns. The detailed updates are postponed until the statement of the pseudo-code. When all the necessary updates are performed, we repeat the procedure by considering  $\pi'$ . The proofs of the remaining claims are similar to the proofs of the previous section.

If  $\pi(i) > \pi(j)$ , we shift  $\pi(i)$  between columns  $\pi(j-1)$  and  $\pi(j)$  (i.e.  $\pi(i)$  is removed from between columns  $\pi(i-1)$  and  $\pi(i+1)$  and is inserted between columns  $\pi(j-1)$  and  $\pi(j)$ ).

**Lemma 7.** *There is an improvement by shifting column  $\pi(i)$  between columns  $\pi(j-1)$  and  $\pi(j)$  if and only if  $\delta > 0$  where  $\delta$  is computed in (12-14)*

$$\delta^+ = \sum_{k=1}^{k=m} \left( -A_{\pi(i-1)}^k \times A_{\pi(i)}^k - A_{\pi(i)}^k \times A_{\pi(i+1)}^k + A_{\pi(i-1)}^k \times A_{\pi(i+1)}^k \right) \quad (12)$$

$$\delta^- = \sum_{k=1}^{k=m} \left( -A_{\pi(j-1)}^k \times A_{\pi(i)}^k - A_{\pi(i)}^k \times A_{\pi(j)}^k + A_{\pi(j-1)}^k \times A_{\pi(j)}^k \right) \quad (13)$$

$$\delta = \delta^+ - \delta^- \quad (14)$$

If  $\pi(i) < \pi(j)$ , we shift  $\pi(i)$  between columns  $\pi(j)$  and  $\pi(j+1)$ .

**Lemma 8.** *There is an improvement by shifting column  $\pi(i)$  between columns  $\pi(j)$  and  $\pi(j+1)$  if and only if  $\delta > 0$  where  $\delta$  is computed in (15-17)*

$$\delta^+ = \sum_{k=1}^{k=m} \left( -A_{\pi(i-1)}^k \times A_{\pi(i)}^k - A_{\pi(i)}^k \times A_{\pi(i+1)}^k + A_{\pi(i-1)}^k \times A_{\pi(i+1)}^k \right) \quad (15)$$

$$\delta^- = \sum_{k=1}^{k=m} \left( -A_{\pi(j)}^k \times A_{\pi(i)}^k - A_{\pi(i)}^k \times A_{\pi(j+1)}^k + A_{\pi(j)}^k \times A_{\pi(j+1)}^k \right) \quad (16)$$

$$\delta = \delta^+ - \delta^- \quad (17)$$

Invoking similar arguments as previously, we prove that the complexity of the shifting procedure is  $O(mn^2(f-m))$ .

### 3 Computational experience

We experimented the local-improvement heuristic on a large number of real-world, as well as randomly generated, instances. Computational experience shows that the proposed algorithm constitutes a viable heuristic method for CBM, especially in the lack of existing methods. One direction for future research emerges. Using the two local improvement procedures, the design of a meta-heuristic can help escaping the local optimum and continuing the improvement process.