

**6.046 Problem 1-1**Collaborators: *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<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X file so that you can generate one PDF per problem to submit to Stellar.