

6.046 Problem 1-1Collaborators: *none*

(a) Consider the situation of $V = u_0, u_1, u_2$ and $E = (u_0, u_1), (u_1, u_2)$, with $p_0 = 2, p_1 = 3, p_2 = 2$. Using the “greedy” algorithm described in the problem, we will choose u_1 at the first step, and remove u_1, u_0 and u_2 , as u_0 and u_2 are neighbors of u_1 . Then the total profit we get is 3. However, if we select u_0 and u_2 instead, we can get a total profit of 4, which indicates that the “greedy” algorithm doesn’t work.

(b) This problem is that given a tree every vertex of whom has a weight related to it, we need to find a set of vertices with maximum total weight and no two of selected vertices are adjacent.

Let’s randomly select a vertex u_0 as the root of the tree. For a given vertex u_i , there is exactly one path from u_i to u_0 .

Then give some definitions:

Let’s call the next vertex on the path from u_i to u_0 the “Father” of u_i . Then every vertex in V , except for u_0 itself, has a unique “Father”.

For two vertices u_a and u_b , if u_a is the “Father” of u_b , we call u_b a “Child” of u_a . Then any adjacent vertex of u_i is either its “Father” or “Child”. (Otherwise the paths from both vertices to u_0 don’t contain each other, and we can get a circle.)

Let G_i be a subgraph of G , such that G_i consists of all u_j that u_i is on the path from u_j to u_0 , and all edges among these vertices. Then $G_0 = G$, and for any $i, u_i \in G_i$. G_i contains all children of u_i .

Let $A[i]$ be the maximum total weight of G_i (with no two adjacent vertices selected), and $N[i]$ be the maximum total weight of G_i while u_i itself is not selected (with no two adjacent vertices selected). We now have n subproblems (of getting $A[i]$ and $N[i]$). Then we can calculate $A[i]$ and $N[i]$ by:

$$N[i] = \sum_{u_j \text{ is child of } u_i} A[j]$$

$$A[i] = \max \left(p_i + \sum_{u_j \text{ is child of } u_i} N[j], N[i] \right)$$

The reason of doing this is that any G_i can be divided into many G_j and u_i , where u_j are all children of u_i (u_i might also have no child at all). When calculating $N[i]$, u_i itself is not selected, so we have the freedom of selecting the children of u_i . As all the G_j do not influence

each other (there are no edges connecting them), we know that $N[i]$ is simply the sum of all $A[j]$.

When calculating $A[i]$, there are mainly two situations: u_i is selected or not. If u_i is not selected, the result is simply $N[i]$; if u_i is selected, all its children cannot be selected, then the maximum total weight should be the sum of all $N[j]$ adds p_i . $A[i]$ should be the maximum value of these two.

We shall initialize a list $Father[i]$ to all -1 . Then define a function “calculateValues(i)”, which first get the list of all adjacent vertices of u_i . If the list has no element other than $Father[i]$, let $A[i] = p_i$ and $N[i] = 0$, then return; else, for every u_j in the list, if $j \neq Father[i]$: let $Father[j] = i$, and do “calculateValues(j)”. Finally, calculate $A[i]$ and $N[i]$ using all $A[j]$ and $N[j]$.

We directly call “calculateValues(0)”. Then it will call “calculateValues” for all children of u_i , then the all grandchildren of u_i , etc. As this graph is connected, all vertices will be called, and exactly once, because every vertex, except for u_0 , has exactly one Father.

For every subproblem, (every calling of “calculateValues”), it does some addings and a comparing. However, as every vertex has one Father, every $A[i]$ and $N[i]$ is added exactly once. The total running time of the above process is $\Theta(n)$.

Now we have all $A[i]$ and $N[i]$, the next step is to find the list “selectedVertices”. This can be done by running a “check(i)” function: first compare $A[i]$ and $N[i]$. If $A[i]$ is greater than $N[i]$, add i to “selectedVertices” and check all its grand children; else, check all its children. We can prove that after running “check(i)”, total weight of selected vertices in G_i is $A[i]$. We can prove this by induction. For a vertex u_i without any child, running “check(i)” adds itself to “selectedVertices” list, which makes sure that $A[i]$ is reached. For any u_i , if $A[i]$ is greater than $N[i]$, we know that $A[i]$ is calculated from

$$A[i] = p_i + \sum_{u_j \text{ is child of } u_i} N[j]$$

By running “check” on every grandchild u_k of u_i , $A[k]$ is reached in G_k for all u_k . Then for every child u_j of u_i , the total weight of selected vertices in G_j is $N[j]$. Then the total weight of selected vertices in G_i is $A[i]$.

On the other side, if $A[i] = N[i]$, we know that

$$A[i] = N[i] = \sum_{u_j \text{ is child of } u_i} A[j]$$

By running “check” on every child u_j of u_i , the total weight of selected vertices in G_j is $A[j]$, and then the total weight of selected vertices in G_i is $A[i]$.

This step run “check” at most n times, and there is only one comparing every running. Thus the running time is also $\Theta(n)$. Then the total running time is $\Theta(n)$.

(c) This problem is basically the same as (b), except that all weights are equal.

We define a function “find(u_i)” as following:

First, initialize a list L , with only u_i in it. Every time, if the elements in L are l_1, l_2, \dots, l_k , and l_k has at least one neighbor different from l_{k-1} , add one of l_k 's neighbors (not l_{k-1}) to L ; if the only neighbor of l_k is l_{k-1} , add l_k to U , then delete l_k, l_{k-1} and all edges from these two vertices. Then we run “find” for every neighbor of l_{k-1} (not include l_k and l_{k-2}), which will add some other vertices to U . If there is only one vertex l_1 in L and it has no neighbor, add it to U and quit the loop; if there is no vertex in L , quit the loop. Calling “find” from any vertex gives the desired U .

Let's prove that this algorithm works, (namely, gives the maximum number of vertices in U). Let's induce by the number of vertices. When there is only one vertex in G , it's obvious. For n vertices, consider the first time when we have l_1, \dots, l_k in L and l_k has only one neighbor l_{k-1} . Deleting l_{k-1} and l_k , and all edges connecting them as well, we get many trees, and each of them has a vertex that used to be l_{k-1} 's neighbor. Then calling “find” on the original graph equals calling “find” on these trees separately (for a tree doesn't contain l_1 , call “find” with the vertex that was l_{k-1} 's neighbor before; for the tree contains l_1 , call “find(l_1)”). As every calling gives the desired U for every subproblem, and at most one of u_k and u_{k-1} belongs to U , the total U we get is the maximum.

For the time of running: all we do in this process is adding and removing vertices from L , and deleting edges. Every vertex can be only added and removed exactly once, as removing the vertex will delete that vertex from further consideration. As what we have is a tree, there are exactly $n - 1$ edges. Then the total running time is $\Theta(n)$.

(d) Your solution to Problem 1-1 goes here. Remember, *each problem* should be in a separate L^AT_EX file so that you can generate one PDF per problem to submit to Stellar.