ECE 3790 Lab 2 Report

Submitted by: Richard Constantine #7686561

1. Provide pseudo-code for your algorithm? Did it run as expected? What was the stopping criteria?

```
Input adjMat, size; [Adjacency Matrix and associated Size]
Algorithm componentOptimization
stopCount ← 10000; [Program will stop after 10,000 unsuccessful attempts IN A ROW at finding a better solution]
penalty ← size/1.5; [Penalty incurred when the cardinality of the bins differs]
bins ← assignBins(adjMat, size); [Assign each component/vertex to a bin – bins are tracked in 1D array]
oldCost ← calculateCost(adjMat, bins, size, penalty); [Calculate cost of initial bin assignment]
print oldCost;
print bins;
newCost ← optimizeCost(adjMat, bins, stopCount, oldCost); [Optimize cost via greedy, random swapping method]
print newCost;
print bins;
         Input adjMat, size;
         Output bins;
         Algorithm assignBins
         repeat for i from 0 to size-1
                    bins[i] \leftarrow random number between 0 and numBins-1; [In this lab, numBins \leftarrow 2]
          end for
         Input adjMat, size, bins, penalty;
         Output cost;
         Algorithm calculateCost
          repeat for i from 0 to size-2
                   if bins[i] == 0
                              then bin0count ← bin0count+1; [Tracks the cardinality of each bin for the penalty]
                    else
                             then bin1count ← bin1count+1;
                    repeat for j from i+1 to size-1
                                                  then cost ← cost + adjMatrix[i][j]; [Add connections between bins]
                    end for
         end for
         if bins[size-1] == 0
                    then bin0count \leftarrow bin0count+1;
          else
                    then bin1count \leftarrow bin1count+1;
         cost ← cost + (|bin0count - bin1count| x penalty); [Add the penalty due to difference in cardinality]
         Input adjMat, bins, stopCount, oldCost;
          Output bestCost;
         Algorithm optimizeCost
         errorCount \leftarrow 0;
          repeat while errorCount < stopCount
                    rand1 ← random number between 0 and size;
                    rand2 ← random number between 0 and size;
```

```
repeat while rand1 == rand2 || bin[rand1] == bin[rand2] [Ensures 2 unique components in
                                                                      different bins]
                    rand1 ← random number between 0 and size;
                    rand2 ← random number between 0 and size;
          end while
          swapBins(bins, rand1, rand2); [Swap random bins and check the new cost]
          newCost ← calculateCost(adjMat, bins, size, penalty);
          if oldCost < newCost [Compare the cost and keep any better results]
                    then oldCost ← newCost;
          else
                    then swapBins(bins, rand1, rand2); [Swap bins back]
                    then errorCount ← errorCount + 1;
end while
bestCost ← oldCost;
if (size x penalty) < bestCost [Check if all components in 1 bin yields a better result]
          then print "Penalty may be too low";
          then bestCost \leftarrow (size x penalty);
          then repeat for i from 0 to size
                    bins[i] \leftarrow 0;
          end for
Input bins, index1, index2;
Output bins;
Algorithm swapBins
temp \leftarrow bins[index1];
bins[index1] \leftarrow bins[index2];
bins[index2] \leftarrow temp;
```

Yes, the program ran as expected. The stopping criteria is determined by the stopCount. When the number of unsuccessful attempts in a row (at acquiring a better solution) reaches the stopCount, the program while terminate and print the best cost found so far. For this lab, I have set the stopCount = 10,000. Note: Because we are using a greedy approach, this count influences the accuracy of the output (at the cost of computational time).

2. What was your minimum score or solution. What was the percent improvement from and original or initial "solution".

Sample outputs of the program for each of the provided adjacency matrices (using a StopCount of 10,000) can be found in Appendix 1.

The minimum score achieved was a cost of 715 when processing AdjMatCC.txt.

Adjacency Matrix	Percent Improvement
AdjMatAsym.txt	190%
AdjMatCC.txt	336%
AdjMatRand.txt	128%

3. <u>How long did the algorithm take to run? If you doubled the size of your problem did the running time scale linearly, quadratically or by some other means?</u>

Random adjacency matrices were generated using code the matrixGenerator.java code provided as an attachment (same as lab 1) using 50% sparsity. Sample outputs of the program executing on adjacency matrices of size 100 and 200 are provided in Appendix 2 (the matrices used are also provided as attachment).

SizeRun-Time100 components1.09 seconds200 components2.63 seconds

The run time scaled <u>almost</u> linearly with the problem size (i.e. when the problem size was doubled, the run-time almost doubled as well). However, because this program uses a random/greedy swapping method along with many other random elements, and the stopCount is relative to the number unsuccessful (random) swaps, the run-times tend to have quite a large variation.

4. Vary the component population size. How did this affect the running time?

Continuing using the previous data and the same matrixGenerator.java (with a sparsity of 50%), the problem size can be varied to observe run-time (the matrices used are also provided as attachments).

Size	Run-Time
100 components	1.09 seconds
110 components	1.20 seconds
120 components	1.27 seconds
130 components	1.40 seconds
140 components	1.60 seconds
150 components	1.86 seconds
160 components	2.05 seconds
170 components	2.25 seconds
180 components	2.37 seconds
190 components	2.57 seconds
200 components	2.63 seconds

A plot/graph of the results is provided in Appendix 3.

5. How might your basic algorithm be improved?

Instead of using a greedy approach (which usually only acquires a good solution), the algorithm could calculate the cost of each different combination of components (i.e. calculate the cost of every situation using the power set of the bins) to obtain the optimal solution. This would increase the accuracy of the answer, but the would require an impractical amount time to execute when the problem size is large.

Appendix 1
Please enter file name including extension (.txt only) and ensure the txt file is in the same folder as this program. AdjMatAsym.txt
Old Cost = 4138
Bins: 01100000100111000100010011000010111011
New Cost = 2175
Bins: 10101010101010101010101010101010101010
Run-Time: 1171713894 nanoseconds
Ratio (ie improvement): 1.9025287356321838
Program Ends

Please enter file name including extension (.txt only) and ensure the txt file is in the same folder as this program. AdjMatCC.txt
Old Cost = 2400
Bins: 1001100010111011000101101001111100111010
New Cost = 715
Bins: 1001111111111111111111111111111111111
Run-Time: 1080463702 nanoseconds
Ratio (ie improvement): 3.3566433566433567
Program Ends

Please enter file name including extension (.txt only) and ensure the txt file is in the same folder as this program. AdjMatRand.txt

Old Cost = 3711

Bins:

New Cost = 2908

Bins:

Run-Time: 1091843693 nanoseconds

Ratio (ie improvement): 1.2761348005502062

Program Ends

Appendix 2

Please enter file name including extension (.txt only) and ensure the txt file is in the same folder as this program. Q3_1.txt

Old Cost = 6211

Bins

New Cost = 5397

Bins

Run-Time: 1092333977 nanoseconds

Ratio (ie improvement): 1.1508245321474893

Program Ends

Please enter file name including extension (.txt only) and ensure the txt file is in the same folder as this program. Q3 2.txt

Old Cost = 27004

Bins:

New Cost = 24266

Bins:

Run-Time: 2632394778 nanoseconds

Ratio (ie improvement): 1.1128327701310476

Program Ends

Appendix 3

