

# HW6

Dylan Phoutthavong

May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2025

CSCI 3412

## 1. Implementing Dijkstra's algorithm in Python (10 points)

```
.venv(base) dylanpho@Dylans-MacBook-Air-4 HW6 % python dijkstra_trace.py
Node(A with Weight 0) is added to the 'Visited' {'A'} # selected
Relaxed: vertex B: OLD: Infinity, NEW: 4, Paths: {'B': 'A'}
Relaxed: vertex C: OLD: Infinity, NEW: 2, Paths: {'C': 'A'}
Relaxed: vertex E: OLD: Infinity, NEW: 7, Paths: {'E': 'A'}
Node(C with Weight 2) is added to the 'Visited' {'A', 'C'} # selected
Relaxed: vertex F: OLD: Infinity, NEW: 6, Paths: {'F': 'C'}
Node(B with Weight 4) is added to the 'Visited' {'A', 'B', 'C'} # selected
Relaxed: vertex D: OLD: Infinity, NEW: 9, Paths: {'D': 'B'}
Node(F with Weight 6) is added to the 'Visited' {'A', 'B', 'C', 'F'} # selected
Relaxed: vertex H: OLD: Infinity, NEW: 7, Paths: {'H': 'F'}
Node(E with Weight 7) is added to the 'Visited' {'A', 'B', 'C', 'E', 'F'} # selected
Relaxed: vertex G: OLD: Infinity, NEW: 9, Paths: {'G': 'E'}
Node(H with Weight 7) is added to the 'Visited' {'A', 'B', 'C', 'E', 'F', 'H'} # selected
No unvisited outgoing edges from the node, H
Node(D with Weight 9) is added to the 'Visited' {'A', 'B', 'C', 'D', 'E', 'F', 'H'} # selected
No unvisited outgoing edges from the node, D
Node(G with Weight 9) is added to the 'Visited' {'A', 'B', 'C', 'D', 'E', 'F', 'G', 'H'} # selected
No edge relaxation is needed for node, G

Final shortest distances from source node:
A: 0
B: 4
C: 2
D: 9
E: 7
F: 6
G: 9
H: 7
```

## 2. Application of Dijkstra's SSSP and MST algorithms (15 points)

```
• .venv(base) dylanpho@Dylans-MacBook-Air-4 HW6 % python Dijkstra_SSSP_and_Prim_MST.py

Dijkstra Output:

Distance from Denver to 'Atlanta': 2221 with path(Denver to Dallas to Atlanta)
Distance from Denver to 'Boston': 2839 with path(Denver to Boston)
Distance from Denver to 'Chicago': 1474 with path(Denver to Chicago)
Distance from Denver to 'Dallas': 1064 with path(Denver to Dallas)
Distance from Denver to 'Denver': 0 with path(Denver)
Distance from Denver to 'Houston': 1426 with path(Denver to Dallas to Houston)
Distance from Denver to 'LA': 1335 with path(Denver to LA)
Distance from Denver to 'Memphis': 1411 with path(Denver to Memphis)
Distance from Denver to 'Miami': 3194 with path(Denver to Dallas to Atlanta to Miami)
Distance from Denver to 'NY': 2619 with path(Denver to Chicago to NY)
Distance from Denver to 'Philadelphia': 2594 with path(Denver to Washington to Philadelphia)
Distance from Denver to 'Phoenix': 2486 with path(Denver to Dallas to Phoenix)
Distance from Denver to 'SF': 1894 with path(Denver to LA to SF)
Distance from Denver to 'Seattle': 2879 with path(Denver to LA to Seattle)
Distance from Denver to 'Washington': 2395 with path(Denver to Washington)
```

Prim's MST Output:

Denver is selected. Distance: 0  
Dallas is selected. Distance: 1064  
Houston is selected. Distance: 362  
Memphis is selected. Distance: 675  
Atlanta is selected. Distance: 1157  
Miami is selected. Distance: 973  
LA is selected. Distance: 1335  
SF is selected. Distance: 559  
Seattle is selected. Distance: 1092  
Philadelphia is selected. Distance: 1413  
Washington is selected. Distance: 199  
Phoenix is selected. Distance: 1422  
Chicago is selected. Distance: 1474  
NY is selected. Distance: 1145  
Boston is selected. Distance: 306

Edge		Weight
Memphis	Philadelphia .....	1413
Atlanta	Miami .....	973
Dallas	Atlanta .....	1157
Chicago	NY .....	1145
Dallas	Phoenix .....	1422
Denver	LA .....	1335
Denver	Dallas .....	1064
Dallas	Memphis .....	675
LA	SF .....	559
SF	Seattle .....	1092
Dallas	Houston .....	362
Denver	Chicago .....	1474
NY	Boston .....	306
Philadelphia	Washington .....	199

Total MST: 13176

### 3. TinyZip and TinyUnzip (25 points)

Homeworks > HW6 > tinyzip\_output.txt

1	Character	Weight	Huffman Code
2	-----		
3	'space'	1623	111
4	'e'	885	010
5	't'	656	1011
6	'o'	604	1010
7	'i'	542	1000
8	'a'	539	0111
9	'n'	450	0011
10	's'	419	0001
11	'r'	413	0000
12	'h'	385	11011
13	'l'	328	11000
14	'd'	254	01101
15	'f'	220	00101
16	'm'	181	110101
17	'c'	176	110100
18	'u'	175	110011
19	'g'	167	100111
20	'w'	146	100101
21	'y'	124	011001
22	'b'	110	011000
23	'p'	93	1100101
24	'v'	81	1100100
25	'.'	75	1001100
26	','	71	1001001
27	'\\n'	58	0010011
28	'k'	51	0010010
29	'N'	24	00100010
30	'I'	23	00100000
31	'j'	20	100110110
32	'A'	18	100110100
33	'W'	18	100110101
34	'T'	14	100100000
35	'L'	12	001000010
36	'''	12	001000110
37	'G'	9	1001000111
38	'!'	8	1001000010
39	""	8	1001000101
40	'S'	8	1001000110
41	'M'	7	0010001111
42	'q'	6	0010000110
43	'C'	6	0010000111

```
44  'z'      6      0010001110
45  'x'      5      10011011110
46  'F'      4      10010000110
47  'B'      4      10010001001
48  'O'      4      10011011100
49  'Y'      3      100110111110
50  'P'      3      100110111111
51  '─'      2      100100010000
52  ':'      2      100100010001
53  ';'      2      100110111010
54  'R'      1      1001000011100
55  'J'      1      1001000011101
56  'H'      1      1001000011110
57  'D'      1      1001000011111
58  '─'      1      1001101110110
59  'E'      1      10011011101110
60  '?'      1      10011011101111
61
62  --- Compression Stats ---
63  Huffman cost: 39654
64  ASCII cost: 72488
65  Huffman vs ASCII: 45%
66  Optimal FCL cost: 54366
67  Huffman vs FCL: 27%
68  King.txt size: 9061
69  King.zip size: 4956
70  King.unzipped.txt size: 9061
```

#### 4. [Extra credit problems]

**a. [Problem 1: Word Cloud and OBST, 10 points]**

i. Yes!



```
--- OBST vs BST Comparison for 'Denver' Query ---
```

**BST Cost (random order): 2.5815**

```
OBST Cost (optimal): 1.5163
```

Improvement: 41.26%

### Summary:

For the 'Denver' query, OBST reduced the total search cost by 41.26% compared to a randomly built BST.

For the “Denver” News API query, we generated a word cloud and extracted the top 50 most frequent words with their relative probabilities. These probabilities were used to construct both a regular Binary Search Tree (BST) and an Optimal Binary Search Tree (OBST).

The randomized BST had a total search cost of **2.5815**, while the OBST, constructed using dynamic programming to minimize expected lookup cost, had a significantly lower cost of **1.5163**.

This results in a **41.26%** improvement in lookup efficiency, reinforcing the value of using OBST when access probabilities are known.

**b. [Problem 2: Minimal Changes, 5 points]**

i. Example: Representing \$269.63

We convert everything into cents to avoid decimal issues:

- $\rightarrow \$269.63 = 26,963 \text{ cents}$

Using the greedy method:

1. Start with the largest denomination ( $\$100 = 10,000\text{¢}$ )
2. At each step, use as many of that denomination as possible
3. Subtract the value, and repeat with the next smaller denomination

Result for  $\$269.63$ :

- $2 \times \$100 \text{ bills } (20000\text{¢})$
- $1 \times \$50 \text{ bill } (5000\text{¢})$
- $1 \times \$10 \text{ bill } (1000\text{¢})$
- $1 \times \$5 \text{ bill } (500\text{¢})$
- $4 \times \$1 \text{ bills } (400\text{¢})$
- $2 \times 25\text{¢ coins } (50\text{¢})$
- $1 \times 10\text{¢ coin } (10\text{¢})$
- $3 \times 1\text{¢ coins } (3\text{¢})$

**Total coins and bills =  $2 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 4 + 2 + 1 + 3 = 15$**

```
Minimal change for $269.63:
$100: 2
$50: 1
$10: 1
$5: 1
$1: 4
50¢: 1
10¢: 1
1¢: 3
```

### **Assumption Where Greedy Might Fail**

The greedy algorithm may fail if denominations are non-canonical (they don't follow standard coinage).

Example: if we had coins  $\{1\text{¢}, 3\text{¢}, 4\text{¢}\}$  and wanted to make  $6\text{¢}$ , greedy would choose  $4\text{¢} + 1\text{¢} + 1\text{¢} = 3 \text{ coins}$ , but optimal is  $3\text{¢} + 3\text{¢} = 2 \text{ coins}$ .