

CSC373 - Problem Set 3

Authors: Luke Bacchus, Naslin Rahman, Zhuoqian Li

February 16, 2021

Question 1

- a. Let $A(i, h)$ = maximum grade one can receive on i projects if they spend h number of hours on it. The Bellman equation is as follows. For each value of k between 0 and h we calculate the max value of k that maximizes $f_i(k)$ and $A[i-1, H-k]$ which is the max grade one can receive with the remaining time and projects.

$$A(i, h) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } j = 0. \\ \max_{0 \leq k \leq H} (A[i-1, H-k] + f_i(k)), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

To maximize the average grade over n courses we will do $\max \frac{(f_1(h1)+f_2(h2)...+f_n(hn))}{n}$ which is equivalent to maximizing $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(hi)$

```
BottomUp(n, H):
    for h = 0 to H:
        A(0, h) = 0
    for i = 1 to n:
        A(i, 0) = f_i(0)

    for i = 1 to n:
        max = 0
        for j = 0 to H:
            for k = 0 to j
                g = A(i-1, H-k) + f_i(k)
                if (g > max):
                    max = g
            A(i, j) = max
    return A(n, H) /n
```

- b. `Augmented(n, H):`
 for $h = 0$ to H :
 $A(0, h) = 0$

```

for i = 1 to n:
    A(i, 0) = f_i(0)

for i = 1 to n:
    max = 0
    for j = 0 to H:
        for k = 0 to j
            g = A(i-1, H-k) + f_i(k)
            if (g > max):
                max = g
                hours[i] = k
        A(i, j) = max
return hours and A(n, H) /n

```

This question was written and read by Luke, Naslin, and Zhuoqian.

Question 2

- a. The subproblem is breaking down the question into smaller sections, and finding the most optimal way of connecting those smaller sections. Then by finding the most optimal way to connect those sections. This works because we are also trying out every way in which these sections can be divided and thus are trying every possible way of connecting the carts.

The subproblem of this question is defined as: $\text{cost}(i,j)$: The cost of connecting train carts i to j . The Bellman equation is as follows:

$$\text{Cost}(i, j) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } i = j. \\ \min_{i \leq k < j} (\text{cost}(i, k) + \text{cost}(k + 1, j) + \min((w_i + \dots + w_k)^{1/2}, (w_{k+1} + \dots + w_j)^{1/2})), & \text{if } i < j. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Pseudocode:

```

BottomUp(n, W):
    for i = 1 to n:
        cost(i, i) = 0

    for l = 1 to n-1:
        for i = 1 to n-1:
            j = i + l
            if j <= n:
                min_found = inf

```

```

        for k = i to j-1:
            found = min(cost(i,k) + cost(k+1,j) +
                min(w[i:k]^1/2, w[k+1:j]^1/2))

            if found < min_found:
                min_found = found

        cost(i,j) = min_found
    return cost(1,n)

```

Time Complexity: $O(n^3)$ since we have 3 nested for loops

- b. To augment the algorithm so that it also outputs an optimal order of train car connections, we can add to the memory part of the algorithm by adding another array that stores the order. The order is an array that stores pairs in the order in which the train carts are connected. Ex: $[[1,2],[3,4],[5,6],[2,3],[4,5]]$

Pseudocode:

```

BottomUp(n, W):
    for i = 1 to n:
        cost(i, i) = 0
        order(i,i) = []

    for l = 1 to n-1:
        for i = 1 to n-1:
            j = i + l
            if j <= n:
                min_found = inf
                for k = i to j-1:
                    found = min(cost(i,k) + cost(k+1,j) +
                        min(w[i:k]^1/2, w[k+1:j]^1/2))

                    found_order = order(i,k) + order(k+1,j) + [[k,k+1]]

                if found < min_found:
                    min_found = found
                    min_order = found_order

                cost(i,j) = min_found
                order(i,j) = min_order
    return cost(1,n)

```

This question was written and read by Luke, Naslin, and Zhuoqian.

Question 3

- a. Let $y = \text{Green}$
 Let $x = \text{El}$
 Let $z = \text{Greelen}$

The greedy algorithmn would take the ‘Gree’ portion of z and remove that from y such that $y = \text{en}$. What remains is $x = \text{el}$, $y = \text{en}$, $z = \text{len}$, and from there, the greedy algorithm cannot continue further and must return false.

- b. The subproblem of this question is defined as $\text{IsInterleaving}(i, j)$: True iff $z[1] \dots z[i+j]$ is an interleaving of $x[1] \dots x[i]$ and $y[1] \dots y[j]$. The Bellman equation is as follows:

$$\text{interleaving}(i, j) = \begin{cases} \text{True,} & \text{if } i = 0 \text{ and } j = 1 \\ & \text{and } z[1] = y[1] \\ & \text{OR} \\ & \text{if } i = 1 \text{ and } j = 0 \\ & \text{and } z[1] = x[1]. \\ z[i+j] == x[i] \text{ and } \text{interleaving}(i-1, j) \\ \text{OR} & \text{otherwise.} \\ z[i+j] == y[j] \text{ and } \text{interleaving}(i, j-1) \end{cases}$$

Let the length of $x = n$ and the length of $y = m$. Psuedocode:

```
IsInterleaving(x, y, z)
  n = |x|
  m = |y|

  In is 2dArray [i, j] of Bools.
    for i = 1 to n
      and for j = 1 to m

  Initialize In to False at every index

  In[0, 1] = z[1] == y[1]
  In[1, 0] = z[1] == x[1]

  for i = 1 to n
    for j = 1 to m
      In[i, j] = (z[i+j] == x[i] and In[i-1, j]) or \
```

```
        (z[i+j] == y[j] and In[i, j-1])
    return In[n, m]
```

The running time of this program is $\mathcal{O}(nm)$, as initializing the array takes nm time, and the second loop also takes nm time. This algorithm is correct because it recursively creates a 2D array of Booleans based on previous values and then indexes the last element of that array (length of x , length of y) after its creation.

This question was written and read by Luke, Naslin, and Zhuoqian.