

*Note:* Your TA probably will not cover all the problems. This is totally fine, the discussion worksheets are not designed to be finished in an hour. They are deliberately made long so they can serve as a resource you can use to practice, reinforce, and build upon concepts discussed in lecture, readings, and the homework.

## 1 MST Basics

For each of the following statements, either prove or give a counterexample. Always assume  $G = (V, E)$  is undirected and connected. Do not assume the edge weights are distinct unless specifically stated.

- (a) Let  $e$  be any edge of minimum weight in  $G$ . Then  $e$  must be part of some MST.
- (b) If  $e$  is part of some MST of  $G$ , then it must be a lightest edge across some cut of  $G$ .
- (c) If  $G$  has a cycle with a unique lightest edge  $e$ , then  $e$  must be part of every MST.
- (d) For any  $r > 0$ , define an  $r$ -path to be a path whose edges all have weight less than  $r$ . If  $G$  contains an  $r$ -path from  $s$  to  $t$ , then every MST of  $G$  must also contain an  $r$ -path from  $s$  to  $t$ .

## 2 Updating a MST

You are given a graph  $G = (V, E)$  with positive edge weights, and a minimum spanning tree  $T = (V, E')$  with respect to these weights; you may assume  $G$  and  $T$  are given as adjacency lists. Now suppose the weight of a particular edge  $e \in E$  is modified from  $w(e)$  to a new value  $\hat{w}(e)$ . You wish to quickly update the minimum spanning tree  $T$  to reflect this change, without recomputing the entire tree from scratch. There are four cases. In each, give a description of an algorithm for updating  $T$ , a proof of correctness, and a runtime analysis for the algorithm. Note that for some of the cases these may be quite brief.

- (a)  $e \notin E'$  and  $\hat{w}(e) > w(e)$
- (b)  $e \notin E'$  and  $\hat{w}(e) < w(e)$
- (c)  $e \in E'$  and  $\hat{w}(e) < w(e)$
- (d)  $e \in E'$  and  $\hat{w}(e) > w(e)$

## 3 A Divide and Conquer Algorithm for MST

Is the following algorithm correct? If so, prove it. Otherwise, give a counterexample and **explain why it doesn't work**.

**procedure** FINDMST( $G$ : graph on  $n$  vertices)

  If  $n = 1$  return the empty set

$T_1 \leftarrow \text{FindMST}(G_1$ : subgraph of  $G$  induced on vertices  $\{1, \dots, n/2\})$

$T_2 \leftarrow \text{FindMST}(G_2$ : subgraph of  $G$  induced on vertices  $\{n/2 + 1, \dots, n\})$

$e \leftarrow$  cheapest edge across the cut  $\{1, \dots, \frac{n}{2}\}$  and  $\{\frac{n}{2} + 1, \dots, n\}$ .

  return  $T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{e\}$ .

## 4 Huffman Proofs

- (a) Prove that in the Huffman coding scheme, if some symbol occurs with frequency more than  $\frac{2}{5}$ , then there is guaranteed to be a codeword of length 1. Also prove that if all symbols occur with frequency less than  $\frac{1}{3}$ , then there is guaranteed to be no codeword of length 1.
- (b) Suppose that our alphabet consists of  $n$  symbols. What is the longest possible encoding of a single symbol under the Huffman code? What set of frequencies yields such an encoding?